BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 06543 421 7

BRA

GOVODC
BRA
5119
Vol. 4 of 6

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate 90/ Central Artery, Interstate 93

Boston, Massachusetts

Public Hearing: Synopsis of Testimony, Responses to Verbal Comments, Transcript

Federal Highway Administration
Massachusetts Department of Public Works

August, 1985

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

FOREWORD

Public Hearing: Synopsis of Testimony, Responses to Verbal Comments, Transcript is one of five separately bound volumes which constitute the Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report package for the Third Harbor Tunnel/Central Artery Project, as listed below.

1. Final Environmental Impact Statement/Report

2. Public Hearing: Synopsis of Testimony, Responses to Verbal Comments, Transcript

3. Supportive Engineering Report

4. Appendices

5. Two-Lane Tunnel/Optional Fort Point Channel Concepts

Materials for this document are organized as follows:

Introduction; Synopsis of the Public Hearing and Responses to Verbal Comments; and Public Hearing Transcript

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Property Of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SYNOPSIS OF TESTIMONY AND RESPONSES 5

PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

Volume I 51

Volume II 91

Volume III 105

Volume IV 131

Volume V 165

Volume VI 177

Property Of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Property Of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

INTRODUCTION

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY
Synopsis of Statements and Responses

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Introduction

The two-day public hearing held on August 8 and 9, 1983 provided an important opportunity for interested parties to present their views on the information contained in the Draft and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Report (DEIS/EIR and SDEIS/EIR, respectively) for the Third Harbor Tunnel and Depressed Widened Central Artery. At that time, 139 people presented oral testimony. Of this number, 46 also supplied written testimony or submitted a written statement or letter to the Commonwealth containing substantially the same content as their oral remarks. (In some cases, these written remarks were submitted by the agency or group over the signature of a member or representative other than the person presenting testimony at the public hearings.)

This volume contains a complete transcript of all oral testimony given at the two days of hearings. It also contains a synopsis of this testimony and responses to those witnesses who provided oral testimony only.

All written comments received and responses, as necessary, are contained in the FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses Report.

Many people expressed similar concerns about the project, and raised similar questions. Others made statements either for or against the project. Still another group raised highly specific questions on a narrower set of issues. Those people expressing an opinion for or against the project without raising questions or requesting additional information are listed in this report, which also provides a brief summary of their statements. Of that group raising questions or requesting information, certain statements were found to be highly representative and inclusive of the group's concerns as a whole; it was felt that the issues and concerns of a number of people could best be answered by responding to these representative statements. People requesting information on a narrower set of issues also received a response. All testimony and comments, however, were carefully read and considered in the completion of the FEIS/EIR.

Specific concerns related to the project were voiced by a number of residents at the hearings. These include:

> North End - Many people otherwise supportive of the project's long-term benefits expressed serious reservations about the ability of the North End to function during construction. Construction period impacts such as noise, dust, and obstruction of pedestrian routes are primary concerns as are the loss of parking under the elevated artery, the potential for lost business, increased truck traffic on local streets, and the possibility of a deterioration in the quality of life forcing migration out of the neighborhood. The potential for increased development speculation and its detrimental effects on the neighborhood is also a concern.

The Commonwealth is aware of the serious nature of potential construction period impacts on North End residents and merchants, and shares the concerns of this community. These impacts and possible mitigation measures have been initially addressed in Sections 4.4.3, Land Use Impacts, North End; 4.5.3, Community and Neighborhood Facilities Impacts, North End; and 4.6.4, Economic Impacts. Mitigating measures will include barrier walls to reduce noise, dust control methods, and water table monitoring with the use of well points to pump or recharge the tables as necessary. Rodents will be controlled according to the methods described in the MDPW's manual on standard specifications for the construction of highways and bridges; these methods will be in accordance with the health rules and regulations of the City of Boston and state health departments. The Commonwealth will make every effort to restrict construction vehicles on local streets; these vehicles will be restricted to a construction road under the existing Artery. With the cooperation of the City of Boston, parking and traffic regulations will be enforced. Parking spaces displaced from under the Central Artery in the Financial District, Waterfront, and North End will be replaced by the project prior to the commencement of construction. In the long-run, traffic will be reduced on local streets because of the project. During construction, street circulation changes will be made to discourage commuter traffic in the neighborhood.

The project team will continue environmental study of construction during preliminary design to resolve potential staging impacts. Legal guarantees regarding the use of these measures can be made in the form of specifications to construction documents and contracts. The Commonwealth will explore mechanisms to minimize impacts and will work with the city in this matter. The Commonwealth agrees that community residents should play a major role in determining the use of the new parcels of land created from the old Central Artery. As soon as the project is approved the Commonwealth will initiate a planning process in coordination with the city which will include the community, and representatives of affected neighborhoods. The Commonwealth will continue meeting with representatives of the North End to solicit ideas on the structure of this participation process and to help define mitigating measures more precisely.

East Boston - Residents voiced concerns regarding the project's overall effect on the environment, potential increases in traffic on local streets, Massport growth policy, and mass transit as an alternative to the project.

The FEIS/EIR concludes that the environment of East Boston will not be adversely affected by the project. Local traffic will not increase. Traffic will decrease substantially on Porter Street and the access road to the Airport. The East Boston Memorial Stadium will experience reduced noise because of the construction of a noise barrier and improved air quality because of improved Airport traffic flow. Reduced

traffic on Rt. 1A and on the Airport system will reduce backups at the toll plaza resulting in improved air quality. The Commonwealth will encourage the use of high occupancy vehicles to the Airport; the bus ramps and connections between South Station and the Airport is one element of this plan. The community will benefit from Massport and City efforts to control the spread of Airport-related activities in East Boston. The continued expressions of concern by East Boston residents contributed to the final design/alignment of the Preferred Alternative. Mass transit was examined in this and earlier studies and was found to be an inadequate solution to the problems of the existing highway system.

South Boston - The location of ventilation buildings and the effect of these buildings and the toll plaza on air quality is a concern, as is the impact on traffic and development resulting from the project.

During design, the configuration of the vent building and toll plaza will be established to mitigate adverse air quality impacts. The location of the toll plaza will not deteriorate the air quality of the South Boston residential neighborhood or the proposed developments in industrial South Boston. Traffic on local streets will decrease most significantly on Day Boulevard as it approaches L Street, on D Street, and on Melcher Street. The project offers truck traffic a more attractive route to the expressways than shortcutting through the neighborhood. Traffic on the project roadway will also tend to sort itself out with trucks tending to exit at the interchange near the Boston Marine Industrial Park and cars at the Congress Street/Northern Avenue interchange. Throughout the EIS process, development interests in South Boston and the Gillette Company have been regularly contacted regarding possible impacts to their parcels and have contributed valuable information leading to the mitigation of many of these potential adverse impacts.

South End - Of primary concern to the residents of this neighborhood is traffic generated by the existing East Berkeley Street ramp and the possiblity of improving Herald Street.

Closing the East Berkeley Street ramp and replacing it by improvements to Herald Street is a local street project to be carried out by the City of Boston. It is assumed in the traffic analysis found in the FEIS/EIR for this area. The design of the Preferred Alternative includes these modifications. This design response resulted from the issues of ramps and through traffic repeatedly raised by concerned South End residents during the planning process.

The Commonwealth shares the concerns of community residents regarding the project and is committed to maintaining the quality to life in these neighborhoods. Further, the Commonwealth is committed to the basic concept of equity for those people who are most affected by major regional transportation facilities. For these reasons, a program to review the impact of zoning and other land use control mechanisms (including various de facto licensing by Massport of off-Airport industrial uses) will be undertaken immediately as one element of a total program of mitigation to be included as an integral element of the Preferred Alternative. Lifting the EPA ban on increasing on-Airport parking is being pursued by the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth will encourage the hiring of East Boston, South Boston, Chelsea, and Revere residents at Logan Airport and Airport-related facilities. The Commonwealth will ask the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission to act aggressively to develop satellite airports. On an experimental basis, further sound-proofing of residences in East Boston will be examined. The Commonwealth will aggressively pursue high speed rail service between Boston and New York.

Concerns expressed over certain issues which are outside the scope of this project, such as local street improvements, have been noted by the Commonwealth and will receive attention although not within the parameters of this particular project.

NOTE: The following listing contains a brief synopsis of the comments of all persons who testified. An asterisk identifies persons whose statement also required a more specific response. References are made within the responses to sections in the FEIS/EIR. References are made within the reponses to Sections in the FEIS/EIR. References are also made to written statements submitted by those listed, which are included in one separate report (DEIS/EIR, Supplemental DEIS/EIR, and Public Hearing Written Comments and Responses). The references to "Volume" in the listing below are to the six books containing the full public hearing testimony. The page numbers are the numbers of those pages within the volume of testimony.

Volume I - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

1. Arthur Osborne
p. 1-24

President, Mass. AFL-CIO Council; Represents 400,000 members of AFL-CIO in Massachusetts
Pro tunnel for jobs, economic benefits for shortand long-term. Points out that Central Artery used as interstate, so should rebuild with Federal dollars.

2. Anna DeFronzo
p. 1-27

East Boston Resident, 12 Lamson Court
There will be tunnel sooner or later. Favors new Third Harbor Tunnel proposal because it avoids neighborhood and goes to Bird Island Flats.

3. Kenneth R. Rezendes
p. 1-28

President of K.R. Rezendes of Assonet
Chairman of Construction Industries of Mass.
Supports project. Getting rid of congestion good for city.

4. Walter Ryan
p. 1-32

Operating Engineers Local 4 - Chairman, State Labor Council Vice Chairman, Board of Directors Highway Transportation Council of Massachusetts
Can't get more jobs unless have better transportation. For the project.

5. Sal Venezia
p. 1-35

East Boston Resident
Favors Third Harbor Tunnel and Central Artery.

6.* Joseph V. Cinserulli
p. 1-38

East Boston Land Use Council, East Boston Resident
OK if tunnel goes to Bird Island Flats but want certain guarantees -- Route 1A will not be widened or extended to I-95, no more encroachment on East Boston. Progress, but not at expense of East Boston.

RESPONSE:
Traffic projections to the year 2010 indicate that the extension or widening of Route 1A is not necessary, and such an action is not envisioned as part of this project. The Commonwealth is aware of the concerns of East Boston on this issue, and will see that they are addressed if the same question should occur as part of the planning for any other project.

Volume I - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

7.	Charles F. Spillane p. 1-41	General Agent, Secretary, Treasurer of Boston Building Trades For the project. Have to satisfy East Boston, however.
8.	Thomas G. Evers, Jr. p. 1-42	President, Mass. Building Trades Council; 9,000 members Favors project because will generate jobs and will not take homes.
9.	Louis Russo p. 1-43	East Boston resident Wanted some sort of confirmation that 5A was a reasonable plan.
10.	Lawrence Sullivan p. 1-45	Executive Secretary, Greater Boston Labor Council of AFL-CIO; Director, Government Land Bank In favor of project. Will generate jobs throughout economy. Also pleased that people in East Boston support project.
11.	Daniel Prigmore p. 1-48	President of BOSCOM Supports project. Provides access, takes traffic off residential streets.
12.*	Ms. Beverly James p. 1-49	GSA Opposes Alternative 3A because of taking of Appraisers Stores Building. Have put $3 million to $5 million into the building. RESPONSE: Alternative 3A has been rejected for the reasons stated in Section 2.4. Also, see response to GSA letter of August 19, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.
13.	James O'Leary p. 1-50	General Manager, MBTA Favors plan. Reminds that Blue Line is really third tunnel, new one would be fourth. Advocates balanced system. Ongoing funds being spent on transit to complement auto garage, etc.
14.	Frank Morris p. 1-55	In favor of project because will bring economic and visual benefits. Can't miss opportunity for Federal funds.
15.	Joseph Doherty p. 1-58	Charlestown Resident, 109 High Street In favor of project because will relieve traffic congestion, make city look better.

Volume I - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

16. Senator Bachrach
p. 1-60

Representative of Wards 21 and 22 - Allston Heights and Brighton, Cambridge, Watertown, Belmont
For the project because will facilitate traffic flow, improve aesthetics, rejoin city. Problem of Central Artery affects all New England.

17. David Sullivan
p. 1-64

Cambridge resident, 83 Inman Street; Democratic State Commission for East Boston and North End
Opposes Third Harbor Tunnel because would increase traffic to East Boston, increase air pollution and promote Airport growth. Endorses proposals of CATT -- capping Logan expansion, ferries, better transit, and one-way tolls.

18. Barney Frank
p. 1-67

U.S. Congressman
Supports it -- "an overall package that makes sense".

19.* Lois Pines
p. 1-71

Waban Resident, 40 Keene Road, attorney
Supports plan as innovative, sensitive, environmentally sound, economic boon, creates jobs. People at 150 Causeway Street would be glad to move -- area is ugly and unsafe. Have to take down Central Artery in order to revitalize North Station area. Need to assure special process for businesses displaced or whose business is disrupted during construction.

RESPONSE:
Relocation procedures and benefits are discussed in Section 4.3, Relocation Impacts. As discussed in this section, an extensive process, including an appeals procedure, is available to affected businesses. Participation by the public will be encouraged during the design phase of the project.

20. Sen. Allen McKinnon
p. 1-80

Representative - Cohasset, Duxbury, Hingham, Marshfield Scituate, Weymouth
Supports project -- vital to continued level of Boston. Must relieve traffic congestion.

21.* Judith Kurland
p. 1-83

New England Medical Center, Director of Public Affairs
Supports project because will improve emergency vehicle access. "Extremely supportive." Concerned that pushcart operations will be disrupted. South Boston should participate in planning.

RESPONSE:
Pushcart storage and truck areas will be replaced in the immediate area of Haymarket both during and following construction. See Section 4.4.3 for a discussion of the pushcart operations.

Kurland (cont'd)

The Commonwealth is committed to a planning process which will elicit ideas and comments from all affected neighborhoods and interested citizens.

22.* Budge Upton
p. 1-85

Cabot Cabot & Forbes

Supports Alternative 5A Modified. Wants FEIS/EIR to address traffic impacts on Congress Street/Northern Avenue/Seaport Avenue connection route. Define LOS projections at connector intersections with Congress Street and Northern Avenue, the traffic volumes on connector road broken down by truck versus cars. CCF will engage consultant to look further on implications of the Seaport alignment with respect to east/west connector.

RESPONSE:
These issues have been examined in the FEIS/EIR. Refer to Section 4.2, Traffic Impacts for tables on volume to capacity and level of service and for percent of trucks in peak hour volumes. Also, see response to Cabot Cabot & Forbes letter in FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

23.* David Davis
p. 1-87

Executive Director of Massport

Thinks improvement to Central Artery good, but also need improved transit to Airport. Favors Alternative 5A Modified -- will allow additional service to Logan. Potential to provide bus service from North Station and Haymarket. Against 5A toll plaza and vent stack on Airport land; for toll plaza on Massport land in Commonwealth Flats. Need to address in FEIS/EIR:

1. Define construction phasing at Bird Island Flats, effect on Logan traffic, maintain full access, reduce impact on business, hangers, passengers, residents.
2. Connection to Airport loop -- must be grade separated.
3. Full assessment of relocation and disruption costs.

Wants tunnel connections designed to allow maximum flexibility to Logan users -- direct movements between Central Artery and existing tunnels under all movements. Seaport access should have northbound moves.

RESPONSE:
Substantially the same questions appear in a letter from Massport. See response to this letter in FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

24.* Fred Langone
p. 1-100

Boston City Councilor

Against project for disruption it will cause to North End. Disruption will last 15-20 years, no parking, loss of business, traffic on local streets, disruption of pushcarts, Quincy Market. Shouldn't put in ventilation buildings near existing tunnels. Recommends construction of Leverett Circle connector, construction of an inner belt, and expansion of rapid transit to North and South Shore.

RESPONSE:
Councillor Langone's comments provide an important and representative overview of the concerns voiced by the North End Community.

Construction could last up to 12 years and the Commonwealth is committed to maintaining the stability and quality of life in the North End and to the development of methods to promote neighborhood stability. Parking spaces displaced from under the Central Artery in the Financial District, Waterfront, and North End will be replaced by the project prior to the commencement of construction. Pushcart storage and truck areas will be replaced in the immediate area of Haymarket both during and following construction. The vent buildings will be sited in a manner sensitive to ambient air quality.

The additional construction projects mentioned, while not directly included in the scope of this project, represent important concerns to be appropriately handled by EOTC.

See Sections 4.4.3 and 4.5.3, for a discussion of impacts and mitigating measures in that neighborhood, especially replacement parking and maintenance of local business during construction.

A Leverett Circle connector road was studied for several years in the 1960s and has been rejected by the Commonwealth. The proposed Central Artery Project in combination with the already approved Charlestown Project will provide for new ramp connections from the Mystic River Bridge and Interstate 93 to the Leverett Circle Area, without the construction of an additional bridge over the Charles River.

The Mystic River Bridge did in fact receive new bridge decks in the mid-1970s.

Langone (cont'd)

The reference to 2,000 parking spaces between North Station and State Street is inaccurate. In the North Station area, a total of 680 spaces will be taken by the project of which 440 are privately owned. In addition, there will be 180 spaces taken temporarily by the project. Present city plans call for the construction of a major parking garage in the North Station area between the GSA Building under construction and the present artery ramps. This garage could provide for up to 2,000 spaces providing for a net increase of parking spaces in the North Station area. In the North End, some 440 parking spaces will be taken by the project. The Commonwealth is committed to replacing all spaces before they are taken by construction activities.

According to present construction staging plans, neither Salem Street nor Hanover Street will be narrowed by the project. A section of Cross Street between Hanover and Endicott Street will be narrowed by two lanes for a period of approximately six months during the construction of the eastern slurry wall. This construction is scheduled to occur after the opening of the New Harbor Tunnel, which will cause traffic volumes on Cross Street to fall by more than 50%.

Reference is made to the pollution in front of Martignetti's Liquor Store. This data is contained in the FEIS/EIR Table 49 and demonstrates how the proposed project could make a major improvement in the levels of carbon monoxide concentrations in the North End. Reference is made to "a 100-story ventilation building". The SDEIS/EIR examined the location of a ventilation building some 100 feet in height near the location of the Police Academy Building on North Street. The FEIS/EIR proposes a series of design refinements to produce ventilation structures which can be incorporated into the air right structures to be located over the Artery at a variety of locations.

25.* Joseph Matara
p. 1-110

Haymarket Pushcart Association, President

Construction will devastate the community. Type of excavation proposed -- working artery on top -- never done before. Buildings proposed not in keeping with North End environment.

RESPONSE:
Careful analysis of construction staging was made in response to the critical need to keep the Haymarket in operation during construction. Pushcart storage and truck areas will be replaced in the immediate area of Haymarket both during and following construction. See

Matera (cont'd)

Section 4.4.3, for a discussion of measures to mitigate impacts affecting the operation and storage of Haymarket pushcarts. As described in Section 4.4.4, Joint Development, an ongoing planning process which includes the community will guide development in the new parcels. The design and construction of this project is feasible. See Supportive Engineering Report.

Reference is made to the sentence that the study uses "Cross Street and Blackstone Street as a divider for the construction area" and the construction phasing documentation included in the SDEIS/EIR and the FEIS/EIR shows that the construction will occur to the east of Blackstone Street. The construction phasing diagrams included in the FEIS/EIR show that a segment of Cross Street between Hanover Street and Endicott Street will be narrowed by two lanes for approximately six months, after the completion of the new Third Harbor Tunnel, which is expected to lower traffic volumes on Cross Street by more than 50%.

26.* Albert Tecce
p. 1-114

P.A.I.N.E.D., 53 Salem Street, North End
Quotes pages from SDEIS/EIR which he states give proof of disruption to neighborhood. Same basic statement as Councillor Langone's. Non-jackhammer methods exist to redeck, less adverse impact. North End not considered a community by the city.

RESPONSE:
As discussed in the introduction to this volume, appropriate steps will be taken to assure the continuity of activities in the North End. Construction period impacts will occur, but methods exist to mitigate them. The long-term effects of the project will be positive in this community.

Redecking the existing Central Artery would have severe negative effects. See Section 2.4 for reasons for rejection of the No-Build Alternative.

It is stated that page 47 of the SDEIS/R does not mention the North End. This section of the SDEIS/EIR summarized a series of calculations about highway flow in the years 1990 and 2010, without the new project. As documented on Table 56 et al several major intersections in the Haymarket/North End area were indeed included in the analysis. Reference to these intersections is made on page 48.

Tecce (cont'd)

The speaker states that page 111 of the SDEIS/EIR states that "traffic accident potential in certain North End streets will be increased". The SDEIS/EIR does not state this. Accident calculations included in the FEIS/EIR for selected intersections in the area show that the Preferred Alternative is expected to decrease local accidents by approximately 15%. Similar data is provided in the SDEIS/EIR on Table 81.

The speaker states that "traffic in the North End is going to be heavier" and refers to a reference on page 253 of the SDEIS/EIR. On that page there is a reference that buildings "on the periphery of the North End District on North Washington Street will be negatively affected by some increase in traffic". Traffic is expected to increase on North Washington Street in the block between New Chardon Street and Cooper Street, from which point northbound traffic will use a new surface arterial northbound to Causeway Street. Traffic volumes on North Washington Street from Cooper Street to Causeway Street are projected to decrease. Traffic is also expected to decrease on Causeway Street, Commercial Street and Cross Street. Traffic is projected to increase on Hanover Street. Overall, there will be a reduction of traffic on North End streets as documented in the FEIS/EIR.

Reference is made to the loss of parking facilities during construction. The Commonwealth has made a firm commitment to replace all of the parking spaces taken by the project. The FEIS/EIR notes that the Commonwealth is currently examining the construction of two new garages both on land publicly owned. One garage would be located on the west side of the present Central Artery at Haymarket Square over the Green Line tracks between Haverhill Street and Canal Street. Another site under construction lies to the east of the Central Artery on land currently owned by the Boston Redevelopment Authority and used as an off-ramp loop from the northbound Central Artery.

Construction of these two garages would more than replace the 440 spaces being taken in the North End area.

The Commonwealth has never proposed using school yards as parking facilities.

At no location does the SDEIS/EIR ever state that the North End community has only a 50% chance of survival.

27.* Antonio DiMambro
p. 1-124

North End Resident, 161 Endicott Street

EIS/EIR doesn't define long-range impacts or define future development. Mitigating measures loosely defined and no enforcement specified. Needs to be looked at. Central Artery work will accelerate change. Must have North End residents participate in decision-making process for all phases of Artery project:

1. North End Forum -- what is future of North End?
2. Make new parcels benefit North End.
3. North End must hire own consultants paid by state.
4. Detailed memo of understanding between city, state and North End guaranteeing mitigating measures. State must commit to study long-term effects of project. State will pick up tab if community decides to sue.

RESPONSE:
This statement identifies several critical issues for the North End. Some are touched in an introduction to this volume, and all are included in the response to the submitted written statement. See the response to this statement in FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

28.* Nelson Visconti
p. 1-31

North End Resident

Wants pedestrian ramp at Callahan Tunnel.

RESPONSE:
This statement currently identifies a critical existing hazardous situation. As a result of this project, pedestrians crossing at the Callahan Tunnel will not have to pass through traffic; traffic will be separated from the pedestrian path. This will increase safety in this area.

29.* James Sullivan
p. 2-3

Chairman, Boston Chamber of Commerce
Set up Business Task Force to study EIS with a Technical Advisory Committee. Cy Mintz, Stephen Varga, Don Goldberg, Philip Bonanno, Kevin Lynch, James Brown, Bruce Campbell, Harold Fodden and William Rizzo are members of Technical Advisory Committee. He also named members of the Task Force (pg. 2-8) -- will submit a report to the Governor.

RESPONSE:
This report was submitted and receives a response in FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

30.* Michael Deluty
p. 2-11

Waterfront Businessman near Expressway
1. How will Waterfront piles/watertable be maintained during construction?
2. How will damage be prevented?
3. What will happen because of vibration of trucks over steel plates?
4. How much of traffic on Central Artery is through traffic? -- Suggests tunnel coastline route along Boston Waterfront instead of a depressed Central Artery.

Wants Third Harbor Tunnel done first before Central Artery. Feels Central Artery problems solved by Third Harbor Tunnel.

RESPONSE:
The slurry wall procedure for lateral support is the preferred system for maintaining water tables under adjacent buildings during construction. Since many of these buildings are supported on wood piles, groundwater drawdown outside the excavation will be monitored and minimized. If it is determined that action is necessary, well points can be dug to either pump or recharge depending on need. Subsequent studies during preliminary design will be conducted to establish actual limits of expected settlements and which form of protection is to be employed. See Section 5 of the Supportive Engineering Report.

The vibration from trucks is not considered significant. Steel plates are not going to be used. Rather, reinforced concrete decks will be used during construction.

The FEIS/EIR includes a comprehensive discussion of the subject vibration, including vibration during the construction phases, in Section 4.8.

Deluty (cont'd)

This concept, known as the "pier tip by-pass" (also known as the Fourth Harbor Tunnel), has been revealed to have serious engineering problems due to a conflict between the existing Blue Line/Callahan and Sumner Tunnels. Such a Fourth Harbor Tunnel would either go under or over these existing tunnels. If the new tunnel were to go over the existing tunnels, the top of the new tunnel box would be only 10 feet below low water, which would pose a serious problem for both navigation and ecological functions. If the new tunnel were to go under the existing Sumner and Callahan Tunnels, the deep bore loop would be some 150 feet below water which would cause a very serious problem to both navigation and to the ecological functioning of the harbor.

While the tunnel is designed to have eight lanes of through capacity in most segments, the tunnel is in fact 10 lanes wide. It was rejected because of environmental, engineering and access issues. See Section 2.3.1.

31. Oscar DeStefano
p. 2-19

North End Businessman - Cafe Paradiso
Needs Artery as barrier.

During the construction process all major pedestrian connections between the North End and the Government Center/Financial District area will be kept in operation in order to minimize the impact of foot traffic into the North End.

32.* Theodore Barr
p. 2-22

Resident of Hanover Street
Concerned about adequacy and location of replacement parking, adequate compensation.

RESPONSE:
Parking displaced from under the Central Artery in the Financial District, Waterfront, and North End will be replaced by the project prior to the commencement of construction.

Businesses directly affected by takings as a result of the project are eligible for relocation compensation. An appeals process exists for those businesses which disagree with the initial monetary determinations. See Section 4.3.5, Massachusetts Department of Public Works Relocation Procedures.

33.* Elisa Gomez
p. 2-23

Resident and Retailer in North End
"Plan is an atrocity." Only benefits commuters. What will become of the Freedom Trail?

Gomez (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
North End businesses must be able to count on an uninterrupted flow of customers, and construction staging will give the highest priority to this concern. Major pedestrian routes will be maintained during construction; this includes the Freedom Trail. In the long-term, pedestrian paths between the North End and other parts of the city will be more open and attractive. See Section 4.5.3.

34. Bill Steffens
p. 2-25

Transportation Project Manager at Old Colony Planning Council, Brockton
Third Harbor Tunnel critical to the region, Central Artery critical to relieving region's traffic problem. Must be done together.

RESPONSE:
Under the staging plans described in the FEIS/EIR, the new Third Harbor Crossing would be completed before the completion of construction of the Central Artery element of the project.

35.* Nicholas Contos
p. 2-27

South Boston Resident and Businessman
No Name Restaurant
Against Third Harbor Tunnel; fears will cut South Boston in half. Will hurt merchants -- to experience construction -- should have ferry service.

RESPONSE:
See response to Mr. Contos' letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

36. Larry DiCara
p. 2-30

Boston City Councillor
In support of the project -- 5A Modified -- solves traffic problem. Critical to future growth in region. Redecking will cause serious traffic snarls. Favors 5A Modified.

37. Joseph Capola
p. 2-38

North End Resident, 172 Endicott Street
Favors the project.

38. Rose Giambollo
p. 2-38

North End resident
Favors the project -- need to depress Central Artery and build Third Harbor Tunnel to reduce traffic. "Have faith in Secretary Salvucci."

39. Michael Capizzi
p. 2-40

Former North End Resident, now lives in Wakefield
Supports the project, North End needs the project.

Volume III - 6:30 p.m. to 10 p.m.

40.* Robert Lowe
p. 3-3

North End Resident, 100 Commercial Street
Need detailed study of water tables.

RESPONSE:
A detailed evaluation of slurry wall construction and possible impacts on the water tables in the project area are contained in Section 5 of the Supportive Engineering Report.

41.* Emily Pugliano
p. 3-4

North End Neighborhood Task Force; Member, City of Boston Environmental Commission
Too many unresolved issues to endorse present EIS/EIR. Need written and legal guarantees to protect communities affected by construction period impacts. The community must survive. Guarantees address: jobs, relocation costs, parking and traffic regulations, tax and insurance adjustments. Developable land created is North End land.

RESPONSE:
The several critical issues addressed in this statement are responded to in part in the introduction to this volume. Also, the Task Force submitted a written version of this statement. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for a response to these comments.

42.* Jeff Morgan
p. 3-7

Sierra Club, 3 Joy Street, Boston
Supports Central Artery with reservations and opposes Third Harbor Tunnel.

1. Why is a surface artery needed?
2. Who will pay for the foundations; how tall will new buildings be?
3. Need more greenspace. Should be part of development land.
4. Central Artery conflicts with CSO and West Side interceptor.
5. How will traffic be controlled once it arrives at the Airport?
6. Consider regional airports to divert commercial traffic from Logan.
7. Need analyses of transit access to Logan. Sierra Club will oppose Third Harbor Tunnel unless include planning for new public transit.

Need additional public participation and provisions for UD controls of highway engineering, design control and street and open spaces, design control of joint development.

Morgan (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
These questions are also raised in a letter from the Sierra Club; this testimony is excerpted from that letter. See response to letter FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

43.* Gina Boland
p. 3-13

North End Resident, 172 Endicott Street
Favors project, but needs guarantees against impacts, need parking.

RESPONSE:
The Commonwealth will include specifications within the construction documents for measures to mitigate impacts. Also, see response to written statement of Emily Pugliano of the North End Neighborhood Task Force, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report, regarding legal guarantees.

44.* Elaine Wilson
p. 3-14

North End Resident, 14th Street; Director, North End End Community Health Center
Need more analysis of noise, pollution, traffic problems, water tables before any decision made. Suburbs will benefit most.

RESPONSE:
These concerns have been raised by a number of North End residents and the Commonwealth shares these concerns. A discussion of these concerns appears in the introduction to this volume.

The FEIS/EIR includes discussions of noise and air pollution, traffic problems and water table issues in Sections 4.8, 4.7 and 4.2; Section 5 of the Supportive Engineering Report includes further information.

Responses to issues such as noise, pollution, and other construction impacts will be developed in detail during the design phase, with participation by the public.

45. Walter McLaughlin
p. 3-16

Owns property on State Street block
Historic property cutoff from water by Artery. Supports project because will restore old buildings to waterfront.

46. John Vitagliano
p. 3-17

Represents Boston Traffic & Parking Department
North End has some legitimate concerns. Department will work to answer these concerns. Will protect North End from construction equipment. Generally supports the project.

Volume III - 6:30 p.m. to 10 p.m.

47. Roland Orlandi
p. 3-20

North End Resident, 120 Commercial Street
Law office, 141 Tremont Street
Supports depressing Central Artery, need to improve area near Central Artery, restore neighborhood.

48. Gary Ruben
p. 3-28

Works in downtown Boston, 365 Franklin Street
Concerned about driving slow in tunnel and psychological effects. Feels cost of project will rise above estimated costs. Wonders if a major road is appropriate in the center of the city.

49. Anthony Cataldo
p. 3-29

North End Resident; Director, Environmental Health for Boston and President of Casa Maria
Favors depressing Central Artery and speaks for residents of Casa Maria. No homes will be taken. Redecking the artery would have too great a traffic impact and not gain anything.

50. Jim Rowes
p. 3-31

Resident of Salem
Affected by traffic in city. Supports depression of Central Artery. North End will be enhanced. Does not support Third Harbor Tunnel, would rather see better public transit. Should also spend money to cleanup North and South Stations.

* Albert Tecce
p. 3-33
Second statement
Adding to earlier comments
See Vol. 1

North End Resident
Project will psychologically force people out of their homes in North End and cause a deterioration in the quality of life. States that no facts produced that North End will improve with the project.

RESPONSE:
This and other statements from North End residents comment on the threat to the quality of life in the neighborhood. Analysis of both long-term and construction period impacts has dealt with these concerns. Section 4.4.3, Land Use Impacts includes discussion of the positive effects on the North End. These issues are also discussed in the introduction to this volume.

As stated in both the SDEIS/EIR and FEIS/EIR, no homes or residences will be taken by this project anywhere.

51.* John DiLorenzo
p. 3-35

East Boston Resident
A Third Harbor Tunnel will not relieve problems; where will all the people in a tunnel go? Only adding an opportunity for traffic to spillover onto local streets.

	DiLorenzo (cont'd)	RESPONSE: Traffic analysis to the year 2010 indicates no additional action in the vicinity of Route 1A is necessary and none is presently anticipated. Traffic analysis also indicates local street traffic will be reduced as a result of the project. See Section 4.2, Traffic Impacts.
52.	Marie Cargill p. 3-42	CATT, East Boston Resident Briefly summarized creation of CATT (Coalition Against a Third Tunnel)
53.*	Mary Ellen Welch p. 3-42	CATT, East Boston Resident Opposes Third Harbor Tunnel because feels will encourage Airport growth at expense of better public transit. Feels should explore improved Central Artery and access to existing tunnels; permanent one-way toll; improved mass transit and incentives; satellite parking; ferry system; and cap on Airport growth. RESPONSE: The testimony of Mary Ellen Welch, Marie Cargill, Robert Edding, the representative of East Boston Fair Share, Robert Dimingo, James Casey, and Lucie Parano provides a comprehensive view of the specific concerns of members of this group. That testimony appears verbatim in a letter submitted by CATT. It and the response are in the FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.
54.	Ray Flynn p.3-51	Boston City Councillor speaking for CATT Favors depression of Central Artery but opposes Third Harbor Tunnel because of impacts to East Boston. Feels money better spent on improving existing bridges and roads.
55.	Mel King p. 3-53	Mayoral candidate Opposes project. Feels that there should be balanced development and decentralized growth. Feels federal dollars are dictating the kind of project the state will do.
	Marie Cargill p. 3-57 Continues comment	CATT making this presentation in spirit of cooperation and to convince officials and technicians of CATT's solutions.

56.* Robert Edding
p. 3-58

Vice President, Jeffries Point Harborside Neighborhood Association speaking for CATT
Asks a series of questions:

1. Adverse impacts on wetlands and marine life at fabrication site in Lynn -- these need to be studied more.
2. Must develop a regional mass transit system.
3. What is the content of dredged material and what route and method of conveyance will be used to transport it out of area?
4. Report is too judgmental; no adequate data for assumptions.
5. Water seepage not adequately addressed; what will happen to 10,000 gallons of sanitary sewage?
6. Need to redo traffic studies with one-way tolls in place.
7. Would expanding mass transit provide more jobs than road construction?
8. Has relocation been studied?
9. Cost and amount of energy for lighting and ventilation not adequately addressed.
10. How and where will the excavate from the project be disposed?
11. Why does Alternative 6 provide for a future Third Harbor Tunnel?
12. Alternative 1 does not include improvements to Callahan/Sumner approaches and Cross Street; it should.
13. Should address two-way tunnel to Airport in FEIS/EIR.
14. Investigate increased tolls on existing tunnels to provide free use stickers to East Boston residents; investigate effect on traffic.
15. Provide incentive for mass transit use to Airport.

RESPONSE:
As noted above, see response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

57.* Representative of East Boston Fair Share, p. 3-62

Understands that Alternatives 2 and 4 are rejected but because they are still in study feel they must be addressed. Some comments and questions are listed regarding impacts to the neighborhood. Also read statement from East Boston Fair Share which opposes tunnel; requests clear position of FHWA on connection between funding of tunnel and Central Artery project. The group also protests that the hearings are held in Faneuil Hall which is not handicapped accessible.

Rep/East Boston Fair Share (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

58.* Robert Dimingo
p. 3-66

Speaking for CATT

1. Under Alternatives 3, 5 and 3A, Memorial Stadium will be disrupted; what provisions have been made for its users?
2. The vent structure and toll plaza will increase air pollution.
3. New traffic to the Airport will lead to new road construction to C-1.
4. Fort Point Channel will be adversely affected.
5. How will vibration damage be assessed and compensated?
6. Blue Line expansion not allowed for or addressed, and how will the Blue Line be affected by construction?
7. Impacts on water quality in Jeffries Cove during and after construction not addressed.

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

* Marie Cargill
p.3-69
Continues comment

Continues with comments on 5A.

1. Traffic impacts on East Boston of the additional 17,000 cross harbor trips not discussed.
2. Higher tolls on the new tunnels will force people to use the existing.
3. If fewer people use the existing tunnels, there will be a loss of revenue.
4. The project will cause fewer people to take the T.

Alternative 5A Modified:

1. This is not listed in the summary.
2. Major impact categories are not covered for this alternative; when and in what form will they be addressed?
3. Temporary relocation of Eastern Airlines must be addressed. Will this mean a separate study? Will this become a permanent facility?
4. Will the problems with dust, duration and safety make this alternative impossible to construct at the Airport?
5. Will harmful substances be used during construction?
6. Negative impacts on BIF development must be addressed and mitigated.

Cargill (cont'd)

7. Is this a new alternative? Why are there four lanes when only two are needed?
8. Route 1A can not handle the traffic to be generated.
9. Additional work must review closure of Porter and Wagoner Streets to Logan; relocation of Airport business to Logan; reuse of East Boston land for compatible uses; solution to Day Square traffic problems; eliminate non-local traffic from East Boston streets.
10. More analysis of the vent stack is necessary; how damaging will emissions be?
11. What are the potential 4(f) impacts to the stadium?
12. What are the effects of the construction phase; will the third tunnel become the Central Artery while the new artery is being built?

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

59.* James Casey
p. 3-74

Globe Street Citizens Committee speaking for CATT

1. What additional meetings will be held and will updated timely information be distributed?
2. The information as presented was too technical and confusing.
3. There was not enough time for adequate review.
4. September 30 deadline for one or both projects needs to be clarified.
5. How will pollutants from cleaning tunnel be washed away; what methods will be used?
6. Alternatives 5 and 5A need to be tested for water quality and sediments and effect on marine life.
7. Land use must be more deeply studied for 5 and 5A.
8. What are the business impacts: losses during construction and possible compensation; will city get the development land; will the public have participation input?
9. What are the 4(f) impacts and mitigating measures?
10. Traffic impacts on Herald Street and East Berkeley Street not adequately addressed.
11. Will displaced parking in North End and downtown be replaced and will temporary parking/shuttle service be available during construction?
12. Is a Storrow Drive connector assumed?
13. Who approves use of tunnel by hazardous cargo and will this project be used by such cargos? How will this cargo be handled on local streets?
14. What are the impacts if the Third Harbor Tunnel were built after the Central Artery?

Casey (cont'd)

15. The new surface artery will become a major highway; this has not been addressed.

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

60.* Lucie Parano
p. 3-78

Speaker for CATT

1. How and who will clean, control and monitor the ventilation buildings?
2. How is "acceptable" defined? Is it a federal standard?
3. CO and NO_2 measurements were taken under ideal conditions.
4. The study makes assumptions about aesthetics which should be left to the community.
5. What will the new low level bridges look like from Beacon Hill, the Charles River, and what will be their effects, such as shadows, on MDC park land plans?
6. The visual affect on Fort Point Channel must be addressed.
7. The design of the vent buildings need to be addressed now before the design stage.

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

61.* Gina Scalcione
p. 3-80

CATT Member, East Boston Resident
A third harbor tunnel will destroy East Boston. Airport growth needs to be limited. The Airport and tunnel only benefit the suburbs.

RESPONSE:
These important issues were raised by a number of East Boston residents. The Commonwealth is committed to working on the problem of Airport growth by encouraging the development of satellite airports in the region, sound reduction measures by Massport, and control of off-Airport development of Airport-related business. See the introduction to this volume and Section 1.3.2 of the FEIS/EIR.

62.* Samuel DePaulo
p. 3-82

Represents Boston Typographical Union No. 13
The union opposes the proposed third tunnel. More jobs can be gained from repairing roads and improving transit. Most of tunnel fabrication will be done out of state. Long-term economic impacts of a tunnel have not been addressed.

DePaulo (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
These issues were also raised in a letter submitted by the Union. See response to this letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

63.* Paul Marquis
p. 3-84

Represents East Boston Harborside Community School
Speaker for CATT
Opposes third tunnel. Health will be affected due to increased air pollution, quality of life will be reduced.

RESPONSE:
See response to a letter sent by the community school which raises these issues, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

Marie Cargill
p.3-85
Continues comment

Wraps up for CATT saying the state should have more participation in all transportation projects.

64.* John Kincaid
p. 3-86

Director of Sales & Services for Eastern Airlines
Supports a third harbor tunnel but wants assurances that reservation center, air freight building, and underground fuel tanks will be relocated without interruption of operation. Temporary concourses must also be provided. Eastern will not pay for any of these activities resulting from construction. Also concerned about dust and dirt on engines.

RESPONSE:
See response to a letter from Eastern Airlines in which these issues are raised, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

65. Cervan Towfig
p. 3-90

Medford Resident, 51 Concord Avenue
Believes that additional access to Airport could be made from Tobin Bridge.

66.* Robert Cappucci
p. 3-91

Candidate for District 1 City Council
If a third tunnel is built, it should surface on BIF and provide for better passenger drop-off and pick-up. For the Central Artery, communities must have input and a gymnasium, open space and cultural center for the North End should be provided on the new land parcels. Rent subsidies should be given to needy residents of the North End to fight off condominium conversion.

RESPONSE:
The Preferred Alternative provides a tunnel through Bird Island Flats.

Cappucci (cont'd) As described in Section 4.4.4, Joint Development, a planning process which includes the communities affected will be initiated as soon as the project is approved. This process will encourage the development of methods to insure stability in the affected communities.

Hearing adjourned at 10 p.m.

Volume IV - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

67. Marvin Miller
p. 4-21

Chairman, JRTC
Group has worked closely with state and hopes review process will continue. Endorses entire project as way of improving life in Boston.

68.* William Geary
p. 4-25

Commissioner, MDC
Supports project, will help to reduce accidents, improve safety, reduce hours MDC police have to devote to accidents. Concerned over possible effects on MDC Charles River park land but benefits of depressed artery will outweigh drawbacks.

RESPONSE:
See response to a letter sent by the MDC, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

69. Thomas Charles Barry
p. 4-32

Secretary of Public Safety
Supports project. Feels it will improve safety; breakdown lane will facilitate movement making it easier to move disabled cars; will divert traffic from North End; eliminate confusing situation under existing artery.

70. Joseph Rubino
p. 4-34

Standex/Harding Company, 335 B Street, South Boston
Opposes Alternative 5A Modified with alignment through Commonwealth Flats because it will take this property. The company requires a central location and fears it will be unable to find suitable replacement parcel due to heavy machinery nature of business.

71.* John Larkin Thompson
p. 4-36

President, Massachusetts Blue Shield
Alternative 5A appears feasible. He presumes disruption of business will be further addressed as research continues. Should proceed with both a tunnel and depressed artery.

RESPONSE:
Work will continue into the design phase to develop methods to mitigate potential adverse impacts on the business community. Commitments by the Commonwealth to restrict construction vehicles to construction roads, replace parking displaced by the project from under the Artery prior to the start of construction, and maintain pedestrian paths will contribute to reduce the adverse effects on business. The Commonwealth will explore mechanisms to minimize business impacts and will work with the city in this effort. The goal is to assure the continued operation of all business.

72.* Kathy Simon
p. 4-39

Executive Director, East Boston Chamber of Commerce
Favors Alternative 5A Modified. Include permanent one-way toll in study. Should have tokens which would speed traffic flow.

RESPONSE:
One-way tolls have been adopted by the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority and as such would be part of this project. Implementation of other concepts such as a program for tokens would have to be resolved by the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. See Section 6, Legal and Financial Considerations.

Louis Russo
p. 4-42
Second statement
See Vol. 1

East Boston Resident
Feels there should be a binding referendum to determine whether or not there should be a new tunnel.

73.* Joseph Mullaney
p. 4-43

Senior Vice President, Gillette
Gillette favors traffic improvements, but not the ones studied in EIS because of the potential impacts on water displacement, disruption of operations due to vibration and interrupted access to facility, effect on expansion plans, and loss of storage tank capacity. Modifications to mitigate problems should be looked at in FEIS/EIR.

RESPONSE:
Concerns raised by Gillette led to extensive meetings between the Joint Venture and the Gillette Company. As a result, elements have been incorporated into the design which respond to the company's concerns and operational needs. See Section 4.4, Land Use Impacts and response to Gillette's letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

74.* Dr. Steven Poulos
p. 4-49

Geotech Engineers, Consultant for Gillette
Offers some modifications to Alternative 5A Modified which would make the alignment more satisfactory to Gillette.

RESPONSE:
As a result of extensive meetings, modifications to the design of the Preferred Alternative have been made which are satisfactory to the Gillette Company. See Section 4.4, Land Use and the response to Gillette Company's letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

Volume IV - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

75.	Evelyn Murphy p. 4-52	State Secretary for Economic Affairs Strongly supports Alternative 5A Modified. Seaport access route will aid business, truck/freight transport, "Logan gateway to trade". Good Central Artery essential to all aspects of life.
76.*	Elizabeth Bransfield p. 4-57	President, MAPC The Third Harbor Tunnel and depressed Central Artery will improve traffic. MAPC has task force which will review all technical documents for effects on region and issue recommendations to Governor by August 22. RESPONSE: See response to letter from MAPC, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.
77.	John Crosier p. 4-60	Executive Director, Massachusetts Business Round Table Improved access to Logan important to continued growth of region. Group will await Chamber of Commerce report on project before endorsing any of the alternatives.
78.	Richard DelOrfano p. 4-63	Member, East Boston Chamber of Commerce, Chairman of The Industrial Commercial Section Feels Alternative 5A Modified responds to concerns of East Boston Chamber. Priority should be third tunnel, Seaport access route, Central Artery depression.
79.	Maurice Simoneon p. 4-65	President, Cargo Community of New England Supports Third Harbor Tunnel. Vitally interested in improving access to and from Logan Airport.
80.	Thomas Hogan p. 4-66	Boston Resident Supports Third Harbor Tunnel and Central Artery project. Will relieve city of an eyesore.
81.	Paul Eustace p. 4-67	Secretary of Labor Project as proposed will be boon to economy of city and state generating jobs, better delivery system to airports, tax revenue, multiples effects.
82.*	Carol Sanduck p. 4-69	Transportation Specialist, Massachusetts League of Women Voters Supports Alternatives 5A and 5A Modified. Improving transportation will stimulate growth in Boston. Project will relieve visual blight. Urge further study of commercial takings and stringent standards during construction. Urges that state's 10% not come from transit funds; need to improve public transit. Praises public participation efforts.

Sanduck (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
The Commonwealth will explore mechanisms to minimize business impacts and will work with the City in this effort. The Commonwealth will explore marketing assistance to maintain local business activities during construction.

The League has submitted a written version of this testimony. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

83.* Betsy Johnson
p. 4-74

Transportation Community Chairperson, Boston League of Women Voters
Need remains to balance mass transit and highways.

1. What commitment to transit can be made in this project; support idea of connection between South Station and Logan.
2. Need additional discussion of design and configuration of new surface artery and development parcels.
3. Must adequately address use of surface streets by hazardous cargo.
4. Require additional modifications to East Berkeley Street exit ramp; upgrade Herald Street to remove traffic from residences.
5. Further consider configurations of new Dorchester Avenue and alignments through Fort Point Channel; Channel is adversely impacted. Final report should reprint Figures 71 and 73, pages 14 and 15 -- too difficult to read.
6. Need better coordination between MDC plans and Central Artery plans.
7. Implement measures to minimize harm to Leverett Circle -- pedestrian access a priority.
8. Figures 103 and 104, pages 287 and 289 are difficult to understand.
9. Insufficient discussions of construction impacts on business; what will be real economic costs?
10. Continue public participation efforts.

RESPONSE:
Additional study for the FEIS/EIR has resolved many of these issues. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for full response to the League's written version of this statement.

1. The FEIS/EIR shows that the project, including a major transit connection between South Station and Logan Airport, can increase transit ridership to Logan Airport by 20%.

Johnson (cont'd)

2. Additional discussion will occur concerning design and configuration of the surface artery and development parcels; see FEIS/EIR sections on Joint Development and Aesthetics in particular.
3. Additional modifications in the East Berkeley Street exit ramp have been made and are included in the FEIS/EIR. The project proposes and endorses a new Herald Street to remove traffic from residential areas in the South End.
4. Additional configurations have been considered and the FEIS/EIR documents the proposed alternative which minimizes negative impacts upon the channel, and creates new walkways along land currently inaccessable by pedestrians.
5. During the design phase, modification to the project, particularly in the North Station/Charles River area, will be made to better coordinate with long-term MDC plans for extensions of the Charles River Esplanade walkway and bikeway system.
6. The three-level highway underpass, at-grade rotary, and MBTA elevated intersection at Leverett Circle remains a difficult problem for pedestrian access. The problems of pedestrian access will be addressed in detail during the design phase of the project.

Several modifications have been made in the preparation of the FEIS/EIR to make graphics more clear.

84. Edward Pendergast
p. 4-80

Chairman, Massachusetts Small Business Council
Supports Third Harbor Tunnel and depressed Central Artery.

85. Kristin Demong
p. 4-82

Director, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security
Need good transportation system to maintain continued economic growth; urges approval of the project.

86. Eric Swider
p. 4-85

President, The New England Council
A new Third Harbor Tunnel and depressed Central Artery are necessary; recognize concerns of local business leaders.

87.* Marie Marshall
p. 4-90

State Auditor's Office
Wants parcel D-10 re-examined in light of the proposed project.

RESPONSE:
A letter discussing this issue was submitted separately. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response.

Volume IV - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

88. David Porcaro
p. 4-92

Owner, Dave's Motor Transportation, East Boston
Air cargo time sensitive, need continued good access to Logan to remain competitive. Supports Third Harbor Tunnel and depressed Central Artery.

89. Robert M. Weinberg
p. 4-96

Service Chairman, Massport, speaking on own behalf
Commends participants in study for work produced. Favors Alternative 5A Modified.

90. Richard Pierce
p. 4-98

Public Affairs Manager, South Shore Chamber of Commerce
Endorses in principle the third tunnel and depressed Central Artery. Feels will help the South Shore.

91. John T. Driscoll
p. 4-100

Chairman, Masspike
In favor of Alternative 5A Modified. Will provide better access to the Airport by emergency vehicles. Opportunity to fund project with Federal funds.

92.* George Vasquez
p. 4-103

President, Fort Point Arts Community Inc. of South Boston
Alternative 5A Modified directly impacts 249-259 A Street in South Boston, a recently purchased building for artists' work/live studios.

1. Provide evidence that vent stack will not increase air pollution in area; stack should be moved east. Want cost/benefit analysis of 5 and 5A Modified regarding number and location of vent stacks.
2. Identify noise sources during construction in area and mitigating measures.
3. Cover as much of northbound Congress Street ramps as possible.
4. Keep openings in tunnel roof at a minimum.
5. Need more specific construction schedule to indicate duration of disruption.
6. Need traffic projections for local streets in Fort Point short and long-term.
7. Provide pedestrian access along Fort Point Channel.
8. Rapid transit or express bus service from South Station to the Airport should be part of the plans.
9. EOTC commit to using local South Boston artists for the one percent requirement of project budget for art.
10. Community participation should be a commitment during design and construction.

Vasquez (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
The FEIS/EIR resolves many of these issues. Others such as the use of South Boston artists have been noted by the Commonwealth for further consideration. Community participation will continue to be an important element in the project. For additional response, see the response to a written version of this statement in the FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

93.* Joanne Hutherington
p. 4-108

249 A Street Cooperative Corporation
Feels building will be adversely impacted by Alternatives 5A and 5A Modified.

1. Move vent stack away from building.
2. Proposed detour road should avoid intersecting with A Street.
3. Build a temporary pedestrian bridge over tunnel along A Street.
4. Maintain access to parking on Wormwood Street.
5. Location of northbound Congress Street off ramp better under 5A than 5A Modified

RESPONSE:
A written version of this testimony was submitted. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response. Many of the issues raised have been resolved in the FEIS/EIR. Others will be studied in the design phase of the project.

94.* Michael Taylor
p. 4-111

South Boston Resident, 68 G Street
Candidate for Boston City Council
Feels 5A Modified is the state's preferred alternative and should admit it to avoid confusion with so many alternatives. Need to go back to community with only one alternative.

1. Rethink placement of road through heart of South Boston.
2. Need to clarify vent stack locations, use of road by hazardous cargo trucks, and number of bridge closings must be clarified to public.
3. How will this project impact South Boston in conjunction with other proposed projects?

RESPONSE:
This statement identifies several issues of common concern for residents of South Boston. A letter detailing these issues was submitted separately. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

Volume IV - 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.

95. Thomas Vallely
p. 4-115

Representative, 8th Suffolk District
Supports administration's transportation policy. Praises the long range planning efforts. Thinks proposal good effort to combine public and private investment to benefit economy of state. Helps tie city together if remove elevated structure.

Volume V - 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.

96. Frank Trombly
p. 5-2

Trombly Motor Coach Service, President (New England) United Bus Owners of America
Favors the Third Harbor Tunnel and depressed Central Artery.

97.* Bethany Kendall
p. 5-4

Downtown Crossing Association
Realizes something needs to be done about traffic congestion in downtown Boston. Will review report by Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce regarding the project and submit statement.

RESPONSE:
See response to letter submitted separately containing these issues, and response to Chamber of Commerce report, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

98.* Patricia Loheed
p. 5-6

President, Boston Society of Landscape Architects
Generally in support of project. Feels landscape architects should be included in groups reviewing plans.

1. Carefully consider impact on Fort Point Channel, Charles River Basin, North Station area.
2. Configuration of buildings should favor mixed use development or parks.

RESPONSE:
A letter containing these questions was submitted. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response. These are important concerns and have been examined for the FEIS/EIR. They will receive additional attention in the design phase.

99. Phyllis Charleton
p. 5-7

President, Mercantile Wharf Residents Association
Against the depressed Central Artery because of the traffic and environmental impacts on the North End during construction, and the development consequences which could force North End residents out of the community because of higher rents.

100.* Robert Snowber
p. 5-8

Chairman, Transportation Committee of South Shore Chamber of Commerce, professional engineer
Supports Third Harbor Tunnel and depression of Central Artery. Develop during design and construction phase: construction staging; maintenance of Fort Point Channel as public waterway; and program to encourage use of public transit. Suggests pledge of Masspike system-wide revenues to underwrite third tunnel.

Snowber (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
Every effort will be made during the design phase to develop a design which will minimize disruption of communities during construction. As part of the 106 Agreement, preliminary design will pay attention to maintaining the historic character of Fort Point Channel. Efforts will be made to encourage the use of mass transit as a possible construction period mitigating measure. Related concerns are addressed in Section 4.4.4, Joint Development.

One method identified for payment of the state's 10% is a toll on the existing tunnels and proposed facilities. This method is discussed in Section 6, Legal and Financial Considerations. Other means of funding and structuring of tolls will have to be worked out at a later date.

101. John A. McDonough
p. 5-12

Boston Resident, 31 Milk Street; Director of Operations Brockton Street Railway Company in Plymouth and affiliated bus companies in Lynn and Wakefield
Supports a third tunnel and depressed artery because of the increased efficiency in transporting passengers from the south to Boston and Logan.

102.* Pat Wells
p. 5-14

Boston Educational Marine Exchange
Feels project will adversely impact Fort Point Channel. Specifically objects to new Dorchester Avenue along water; danger will cut off recreation and amenity value of Fort Point Channel. Need place in downtown where boats can land.

1. Study does not address impact on Channel's potential as water transportation arm of South Station.
2. Study does not look at alternative transportation measures to relieve traffic congestion such as ferry service, improved T service, trains, etc.

RESPONSE:
These are important concerns which have been considered in the course of this study. A written version of this testimony was submitted. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response.

103.* Martin Nee
p. 5-20

Legislative Aide to Representative Michael Flaherty of South Boston
Matters of concern:

1. Will 5A Modified accommodate hazardous materials?
2. Air quality impacts of toll booth in South Boston on the community.

Nee (cont'd)

3. Where will vent stacks be located?
4. Guarantee to provide employment for city residents first.

RESPONSE:
These are important concerns to the South Boston community and have received attention in the study. A letter containing these issues was submitted. A more complete answer to the comments appears in the response to that letter. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

104.* Joseph Tuzzolo
p. 5-22

Treasurer, Braman Dow & Company,
239 Causeway Street, Boston

1. Will the slurry wall eliminate all parking on property for employees since abuts the current central artery? If yes, can you provide employees with comparable safe parking without cost within a reasonable distance from our location?
2. Will the slurry wall reduce our access to our driveway, our property, and material storage area abutting the current central artery?
3. Will our weekly deliveries of pipe and related inventory items via trucks, flatbed and box (40 foot trailers) have access to our Traverse Street entrance?
4. Taking all of the above into account, will our material handling equipment have free access without restriction of travel on our property to off load all deliveries?
5. Will the Federal or state government provide for temporary storage and warehousing during construction and fund this cost during the entire construction period?
6. Since our warehouse ships and loads all materials from our rear docks, which abut the existing central artery, will all vehicles have access to our loading docks and material handling equipment?
7. Will the Federal government provide funding for warehousing during construction and all additional cost of material handling related to disruption during related construction?
8. Will our customers have full access to our driveway, Traverse Street, and will we have the room to load trucks via material handling equipment?

Tuzzolo (cont'd)

9. As a result of construction, customers who under normal conditions pick up material ordered, will require delivery by us to their location. This will result in additional costs both in required vehicles and personnel. Will the Federal/state government provide funding to defray all additional cost for labor and equipment during construction?
10. Will the new surface roadway take any of our parking and/or storage capacity currently existing?
11. We require assurances and commitments that any disruption to our normal business operations, directly or indirectly, caused by the depression of the Central Artery will be fully compensated by the state and/or Federal governments.

RESPONSE:
In order to ensure continued operations at Braman Dow and Company, the Commonwealth is committed to (in order of preference) either reconfiguring the temporary ramp which disrupts access to the property, reconfiguring the building to allow for loading from Medford and/or Causeway Streets, or providing new warehousing space in another location. Details will be worked out during later design stages; representatives of Braman Dow and Company will participate in this process.

105.* Jonathan Berg
P. 5-27

Malden Resident, 12 Glenrock Avenue

Feels the money for the project can be better spent repairing existing infrastructure. Better alternative is to restrict Airport hackney limousines, provide ferries, and restrict Callahan tunnel to commercial and private auto use.

Berg (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
See response to CATT written statement, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report regarding transit systems, and the introduction to this volume. Alternate methods of transportation are a significant issue. However, restrictions on the use of the existing tunnels are not directly within the scope of this project.

106.* Kenneth Terrell
p. 5-31

Cambridge Resident, 140 Wollaston Avenue
Suggests adding North Station/South Station surface connector link to depression concept, providing continuous service from New York City to northern New England and Canada. Could also use beams from dismantled artery to fix bridges.

RESPONSE:
A North Station/South Station rail connection was examined in the 1980 Corridor Planning Study. This and other transit options were not carried forward for additional analysis because of severe geometric problems in building both a full scale highway solution and a North/South Station rail connector.

At the beginning of this study, this option was re-examined. It was determined that the depressed alignment did not afford sufficient width for a rail line. This would have required additional takings along the alignment. Both the surface artery and depressed artery will afford quick access for buses going between North and South Stations.

107.* Nina Meyer
p. 5-35

North End Resident; Director, Historic Neighborhoods Foundation
If a third tunnel is built, the existing tunnels should be closed because of their impact on East Boston. Should have a ferry system instead and better subways. Would like to see Central Artery come down, but feels construction period and impacts are too great. The EIS has been too rushed.

RESPONSE:
A separate written statement containing these remarks was submitted. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response. Also see the response to CATT's statement in the same volume.

Volume VI - 6:30 p.m. to 10:55 p.m.

108. Virgil Virgilio
p. 6-3

North End Resident
Favors depression of Central Artery. Will remove barrier and relieve noise and pollution. Construction period would not be much worse than existing conditions.

109.* Martin Forgione
p. 6-7

East Boston Resident, 406 Franklin Street

1. What happens to increased traffic after it leaves Airport traveling north to Route 1A? Will it travel between Neptune Road and Bell Circle, impacting Frankfurt Street? Has this been studied?

RESPONSE:
The potential for increased traffic is a serious concern of the East Boston community. A written statement was submitted separately. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

110.* Paul Curtis
p. 6-13

South End Resident, 13 Dwight Street
East Berkeley Street increasingly residential and suffering from traffic noise.

RESPONSE:
The closing of the East Berkeley Street ramp and improvements to Herald Street are a critical concern of the South End community as evidenced by this statement and a number of others which raise the same issue. This project assumes the closing of the East Berkeley Street ramps and improvements to Herald Street, efforts planned by the City of Boston. See Section 2.5.1, Herald Street Extension.

The proposed project has been designed to minimize traffic impacts on East Berkeley Street. The proposed project specifically includes new connector ramps feeding a new widened Herald Street which would be constructed as a major alternative route to East Berkeley Street. Traffic on East Berkeley Street should be lessened by the project.

111.* Clark Frazier
p. 6-16

South End Resident, 38 Dwight Street Member, SECOT; Chairman, Boston Air Pollution Control Council
Generally South End residents supportive about depressing the Central Artery and open minded about a third tunnel, but will not support unless the ramps are moved from East Berkeley to Herald Street.

Frazier (cont'd)

1. Include Herald parking lot within the project area.
2. Left-handed Mass. Avenue northbound on-ramp will be hazardous for trucks going from Lancaster Boulevard to the seaport access route.

RESPONSE:
The Herald Street extension is assumed in the project. See Section 2.5.1, Herald Street Extension. The Mass. Avenue interchange and the Herald Street parking lot are outside the limits of the project, but the Commonwealth agrees that they bear an important relationship to the project and will take parallel steps to deal with them.

In response to concerns raised by many citizens of the South End at the public hearing, the project has been redesigned to emphasize the use of widened Herald Street instead of the use of East Berkeley Street. This design change has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative.

112.* Robert Harkness
p. 6-23

South End Resident, 131 Appleton Street, Director, South End Historical Society
Group supports Central Artery depression and will support third tunnel if:

1. Herald Street replaces East Berkeley Street as main access route to Back Bay.
2. Eliminate East Berkeley Street access to Southeast Expressway.
3. Reconstruct Mass. Avenue interchange to provide four lanes of southbound traffic and truck access between Roxbury and South Boston.

RESPONSE:
The Herald Street extension is assumed in the project. See Section 2.5.1, Herald Street Extension. The elimination of the East Berkeley Street access to the Southeast Expressway and the reconstruction of the Mass. Avenue interchange are outside the project's scope; they fall under the Southeast Expressway upgrading project.

113.* Carolyn Gritter
p. 6-24

South End Resident, 52 Chandler Street, Chairman, Ellis Neighborhood Assocation
Urge removal of north and south on and off ramps from Southeast Expressway to East Berkeley Street as part of the project.

1. DEIS/EIR and SDEIS/EIR fail to include existing and future traffic volumes on local South End streets.

Gritter (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
Ramp closings on East Berkeley Street carried out by the city have been assumed in this project. A written statement containing these issues was submitted separately. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

114. Paul Buddenhagen
p. 6-26

Union Park Association
Would support project if showed that it would not increase traffic volume on East Berkeley Street and other South End streets and move traffic from East Berkeley to Herald Street.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

115. Linda Ulchak
p. 6-27

President, Bradford Shawmut Association
Supports artery depression and third harbor tunnel if East Berkeley Street ramp redesigned and relocated to Herald Street.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

116. Susan Straight
p. 6-30

South End Resident, 31 Milford Street
Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project must connect to a new two-way Herald Street which de-emphasizes East Berkeley Street, and will only support project if this is included.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

117. Anna Taft
p. 6-32

South End Resident, 29 Dwight Street, Member, H Street Neighborhood Association
Agrees with other speakers about problem with traffic due to Berkeley Street ramp.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

118. Louis Peltier
p. 6-34

South End Resident, 37 Dwight Street
Must do something to safeguard against additional traffic on East Berkeley Street.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

Volume VI - 6:30 p.m. to 10:55 p.m.

119.* Marsha Myers
p. 6-35

Director, Boston Landmarks Commission
No objections per se to third tunnel, depression of Central Artery and Seaport Access route. However, objects to impacts of the various alternatives on Fort Point Channel, especially to historic elements and reduction of Channel through roads, ramps such as shown in Alternatives 3, 3A and 5. Would like the state to adopt a series of measures which would insure against or mitigate these impacts. Also supports South End's desire for Herald Street improvements.

RESPONSE:
The effects on Fort Point Channel and ways to mitigate or eliminate them have been included in the FEIS/EIR. A letter containing these issues was submitted separately. See response, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report. Also, see response to Paul Curtis, this volume, regarding Herald Street improvements.

120. Dennis Sterzi
p. 6-41

Tremont Street/Shawmut Avenue/Berkeley Street/Waltham Street Association
Supports Herald Street improvements. Remove East Berkeley Street ramps.

RESPONSE:
See response to Paul Curtis, this volume.

121.* Fernando Requena
p. 6-42

President, Worcester Square Area Association in South End

1. Provide more recreational access to Fort Point Channel than shown in existing plans.
2. Secondary impact of project will be Airport growth; Massport should be aware of this and take measures to reduce fly-over noise.
3. Reroute heavy traffic through Melrose, Route 9, and Huntington Avenue rather than continuing to Mass. Avenue.
4. Study in detail during construction rebuilding of Justin Park to discourage through traffic.

Supports relocation of East Berkeley Street ramps to Herald Street.

RESPONSE:
1. See Sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.4, Fort Point Channel, regarding the increased potential for recreational and pedestrian use of Fort Point Channel under the Preferred Alternative.
2. Policies to regulate Massport operations are beyond the scope of this project.

Requena (cont'd)

3. Rerouting this traffic is beyond the scope of this project; this is an issue the city will have to address.
4. This action is outside the scope of the project as now defined.

122. Joseph T. Flaherty
p. 6-45

Charlestown Board of Trade, Charlestown CDC
Groups favor the depressed Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel.

123. Bernice Mader
p. 6-46

Quincy Resident, 108 Cornell Street
In favor of depressed Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel to Bird Island Flats. The Airport will grow no matter what and a new tunnel will discourage spill over traffic to local streets in East Boston. Residents of North End and East Boston should use this as an opportunity to get something back from the city.

124.* Peter Cernada
p. 6-53

Member, CATT; East Boston Resident; Vice Chairman, Mass. Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities
Dismayed that hearing not held in handicapped accessible location. Feels third tunnel will harm East Boston. Proposes that alternate routes to Airport already exists -- Mystic Bridge. Further Airport growth should take place at auxiliary airports in other areas -- New Bedford, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell.

RESPONSE:
These are concerns of continuing importance to the East Boston residents. Regarding handicapped access, see response to East Boston Fair Share written statement, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report. The remaining issues are covered in the response to CATT's letter in the same report.

125.* Tom Butler
p. 6-59

President, South Boston Citizens' Association
Reserves judgement on plan; feels need more information on preferred plan. Would also like to see job guarantees to South Boston residents.

RESPONSE:
Community participation will be encouraged in all phases of project.

Construction projects in the City of Boston are required to establish an employment policy target of at least 50 percent Boston residents.

Volume VI - 6:30 p.m. to 10:55 p.m.

126.* Ken Campbell
p. 6-61

South End Resident, Dartmouth Street

Reserves support of depressed artery until impacts on South End looked at:

1. South End intersections listed in document as South Boston should be corrected.
2. Improve neighborhood traffic by expanding Herald Street, moving emphasis from East Berkeley Street.
3. Should include Back Bay exit off Masspike.
4. Possibility of extending Dartmouth Street from Columbus Avenue to Beacon Street past Copley Place.

RESPONSE:

1. These intersections were placed under the general category "South Boston" because of an ongoing concern with these intersections from residents of the South Boston community. However, it is hoped that the organization of the tables did not discourage any South End residents from the data which they sought.
2. The changes in the Back Bay including the introduction of Copley Place and the reconstruction of the Prudential Center do pose traffic problems for the South End community. For this reason, the FEIS/EIR assumes the existence of a widened Herald Street and has redesigned the Expressway ramp system to feed such a new arterial street.
3. A westbound exit off the Massachusetts Turnpike in the Copley Square area would have significant traffic benefit, but poses some very real geometric problems. It is believed that the creation of a widened Herald Street extension will provide this east/west link in a more acceptable manner.
4. The Commonwealth is concerned with issues of local traffic routing in the South End, but this matter is more appropriately dealt with by the various agencies of the City of Boston who have statutory power in these areas.

127. Gerry Pallotta
p. 6-65

North End Resident, Fulton Street

Favors depressed artery and third tunnel because it will improve traffic situation.

128. Tony Mastandrea
p. 6-66

President, Machinists State Council; Business Agent, District 38 Machinists Union

Endorses project "wholeheartedly". Communities will benefit from economic spin-off.

Volume VI - 6:30 p.m. to 10:55 p.m.

129.* Neil Glick
p. 6-67

Boston Resident
Favors depressed artery but opposes third tunnel. Project encourages use of autos which pollute the air; would rather see money spent on mass transit. Project should include mass transit, ferries, and improved Blue Line.

RESPONSE:
These are serious concerns of community residents. See the introduction to this volume and the response to CATT's letter, FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report.

130. Leo Purcell
p. 6-73

Business Representative, Local 103 of IBEW
Supports the third tunnel and depression of Central Artery because of economic effect and traffic benefits and availability of 90% Federal funding.

131.* Arthur Hartnett
p. 6-75

President, South Boston Residents Group
At present, Group is not taking a position on study because of document's inadequacies regarding analysis of impacts. Should include:

1. Location of vent buildings; effects of ventilation buildings and toll plaza on air quality; data on current air quality in numbers.
2. Project initial levels of traffic and roadway saturation levels and estimated time to reach saturation.
3. Percent increase in traffic at container terminals.
4. Construction schedule for closing of roads and bridges.
5. Agreements on specific routes of construction vehicles through residential streets.
6. Agreements to regularly clean streets soiled by construction.
7. Agreements that if construction activity interferes with South Boston residents commuting to jobs, the activity will be stopped.
8. All future planning of project must involve South Boston Residents Group, South Boston Information Center, South Boston Citizens Association, and South Boston Community Development Corporation.

RESPONSE:
1. The precise location of ventilation buildings will be determined during the design phase. The ventilation buildings and toll plaza will be sited in a manner sensitive to air quality standards; mitigating measures will be taken as necessary.

Hartnett (cont'd)

2. In Section 4.2, Traffic Improvements, projections for 1990 and 2010 with and without the project are given.
3. This information is included in forecasts for new development effects on traffic growth. See Section 4.2, Traffic Impacts for the effects of development traffic in regional and local streets including project roads both with and without the proposed development projects.
4. A detailed construction schedule, including the sequential closing of certain roads and bridges, will be worked out during the design phase. The project is not anticipated to affect MBTA operations.
5. Specific routes for construction vehicles will be determined during the design phase; these vehicles will be kept off local streets to the extent possible. This can be specified in construction contracts and monitored by MDPW.
6. Street cleaning can be specified in construction contracts.
7. All efforts will be taken to minimize the effects on the neighborhoods through mitigating measures.
8. These groups and organizations are listed on the project mailing list and have been informed of all meetings and hearings.

132. Bob Kalin
p. 6-79

Former President, Local 105 Association of Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen; Charlestown Resident
Supports depressed artery and third tunnel.

133. Bob Flynn
p. 6-80

Charlestown Resident
In favor of depressed artery and third tunnel.

134.* William Ensign
p. 6-81

Westfield Resident; Member, National Association of Railroad Passengers
Should consider option of rail link between North and South Station as part of Central Artery project.

RESPONSE:
The option of the North/South Station rail connector has been examined in considerable detail in the planning for this project. While the transportation benefits of this option are very positive, serious geometric problems were found in implementing both a full scale interstate highway and the railroad in the same alignment. This, combined with serious institutional problems in funding the railroad connector, led the Commonwealth to delete it from the Central Artery project.

135.* Brad Bankman
p. 6-82

Tolman Manufacturing & Supply Co., 63 Dorchester Ave., South Boston opposite Gillette Co.
Opposes relocation of Dorchester Avenue as shown in Alternative 5A Modified because westward widening of the Avenue to provide a grass median strip would gravely impact ability to do business.

RESPONSE:
This property is no longer affected under the Preferred Alternative. Alternative access to the property is proposed to be provided off Foundry Road.

* Clark Frazier
p. 6-84
Adding to previous testimony

South Boston Resident, Dwight Street
Plan must also include direct shuttle bus access between South Station and the Airport with the proposed third tunnel.

RESPONSE:
Ramps for buses will connect the project to the new South Station Transportation Center, improving access to the Airport. This connection also means the Airport is directly linked with the Red Line, Commuter Rail, Amtrak and other bus lines.

136. Sandra O'Connell
p. 6-85

18 Bickford Road, Braintree, Daily Expressway Commuter
Supports depressed artery and third tunnel. Wants to make sure that there will be enough additional lanes.

137. Dr. Marilyn Canis
p. 6-87

North End Resident
Supports depressed artery. Is inevitable and will relieve area of an eyesore through use of 90% Federal funding.

(Unidentified speaker from the floor voiced his opposition to a new tunnel)

138.* Mark Ferri
p. 6-90

Resident, 11 Bordon Street, Orient Heights
Third tunnel would impact Orient Heights and should be examined:

1. Congestion on Route 1A as result of project. Massport restructure Route 1A and Bell Circle to accept extra traffic.
2. Amend East Boston zoning to limit traffic and parking facilities.
3. Massport should introduce sound proofing measures.
4. Massport should reevaluate noise levels over Orient Heights.
5. Move parking lots and park/fly operations to Airport from neighborhoods.

Ferri (cont'd)

RESPONSE:
These are issues of concern to the community. The Commonwealth is taking steps to resolve these issues. A written statement containing these issues was submitted separately. See FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report for response and the introduction to this volume.

139.* David Stratudo
p. 6-95

Lexington Resident
Better public transportation, including buses, should be looked into.

RESPONSE:
These are concerns shared by others at the hearing. See the introduction to this volume as well as the response to CATT's letter FEIS/EIR Written Comments and Responses report, and the response to Clark Frazier's second comment, this volume.

Robert Cappucci
p. 6-98
Second statement
See Vol. 2

Candidate District 1 City Councillor
Offers himself as catalyst between administration and communities regarding the project. Reiterates comments of previous evening. Adds comment to tear down ramp to Callahan Tunnel, and provide multi-level parking on the development land. Feels third tunnel could be beneficial.

Hearings closed at 10:55 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

VOLUME: I
PAGES: 1 - 135
EXHIBITS: ---

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1983

Commence: 11:00 a.m.

FANEUIL HALL

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Corridor Public Hearing for Central Artery, Interstate Route 93 and Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate Route 90 in Boston, Massachusetts.

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

Present from the Department of Public Works:

Robert T. Tierney, Commissioner

J. William Oliver, Project Manager

Michael Mahoney, Right-of-Way Division

Nicholas Giasullio, Right-of-Way Division

and others.

Present from the Department of Transportation:

Matthew Coogan, Undersecretary of Transportation

I N D E X

Speaker	Page
Robert Tierney, Commissioner, Opening of Hearing	4
Undersecretary Matthew Coogan	10
Arthur Osborne	24
Anna DeFronzo	27
Kenneth R. Rezendes	28
Walter J. Ryan	32
Joseph V. Cinserulli	38
Charles F. Spillane	41
Thomas G. Evers, Jr.	42
Louis Russo	43
Lawrence Sullivan	45
Daniel Prigmore	48
Beverly James	49
James O'Leary	50
Frank Morris	55
Joseph Doherty	58
Senator Bachrach	60
David Sullivan	64
Congressman Frank	67
Lois Pines	71
Senator McKinnon	80
Judith Kurland	83

Speaker	Page
Budge Upton	85
David Davis	87
Fred Langone	100
Joseph Matara	110
Albert Tecci	114
Antonio Di Mambro	124
Nelson Viscoti	131

EXHIBITS

Statement of Anna DeFronzo	A
Statement of K. R. Rezendes	B
Editorial from the Boston Globe	C
Statement of David E. Sullivan	D
Statement of George Bachrach	E
Statement of Antonio DiMambro	F
Statement of Allan R. McKinnon	G
Statement of David W. Davis	H

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

(Judith McGovern Williams present as Stenographer.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: May I have your attention. I think we'll be starting the public hearing in about two minutes.

(Pause.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Good morning. Could I have your attention, please?

This is the start of the formal public hearing on the issues of the Third Harbor Crossing and improvements to the Central Artery. My name is Robert Tierney. I am the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. With me at the head table are Mat Coogan on my right, Undersecretary of Transportation in the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction; on my left, William Oliver, who is for the Department of Public Works, the Project Manager for this project.

I have taken off my suit coat. Mat Coogan has not. Any of you who -- this is the formal public hearing in the sense that we take minutes -- it doesn't have to be formal in the sense you have to dress formally. Be my guest in taking off your

suit coat or anything else.

The program, the public hearing opens today, and is recessed at 11 o'clock tonight, reopens tomorrow at 11, and closes at 11 tomorrow night. We have over a two-day period 24 hours for presentation and testimony. The presentation portion of this 24 hours should be about five percent or less. The purpose of this hearing is in fact to give the public the opportunity to make a formal presentation, either in writing or to speak.

Let me explain to you where we are in the whole process of the environmental impact statement for the Central Artery/Third Harbor Crossing. We and the Federal Highway Administration, who are partners in this venture, have produced the documents, and there are synopses of these documents available in the back of the hall. We have a draft Environmental Impact Statement of our project for the Third Harbor Crossing, for improvments to the Central Artery, with various combinations of options for both the Artery and the Third Harbor Crossing. The draft environmental impact statement has been on the street for approximately five or six weeks. Prior to this public hearing, the Department of

Public Works and the Secretary's office, Secretary Salvucci's office, has held informal public meetings in East Boston, South Boston, the North End, the Waterfront and the South End. Those public meetings were fairly well publicized, and the intent of it was to give people a less formal chance at listening to our explanations for the various alternatives of crossing the harbor and the various options of providing improvements on the Central Artery. This more formal public hearing, we will do less in the way of presentation, and do more in the way of listening, and because this is a formal public hearing required by both the State and Federal environmental laws concerning highway improvements, we have to keep a formal record of everything that is said. For that reason, speakers will be requested to identify themselves for the record. You will be asked to come up here and sit at the table. If you want to sit at the table and turn around, face the audience, it is okay with me as long as you speak into the microphone, as long as your testimony is being heard.

If for any reason someone is here who does not want to speak but wants their views to be heard,

you may write a letter to the Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston, attention Chief Engineer, and as long as we get your letter by two weeks from today, it will be as much a part of the public hearing as if you came down to the public hearing table and spoke.

Also for this hearing, because it is an unusually long one, and one that covers an unusually broad scope, we have had a preschedule of speakers. We have asked people who care to speak to sign up. We are setting a goal of eight minutes per speaker, and I'll play that by ear, depending on how it goes.

If you want to speak and have not signed up, I suggest you go to the back of the hall when I get through talking and try to sign up for some time. We have free timescheduled for three to seven on each afternoon and nine to 11 on each day. So four hours in the afternoon and the last two hours at night, which apperently are not prime time. There is no one scheduled to speak, and we'll try to keep those open for people who have not signed up.

Now the Environmental Impact Statement itself, as I said, is a draft statement. Let me

give you a brief overview of where we go beyond this public hearing. Because both of the improvements we are considering are interstate, which means 90 percent federally funded, or at least 90 percent potentially federally funded, we are required by Federal law to have our decisions in on interstate projects by September 30th, 1983. By having it in, I mean having it in the office of the local federal highway administrator in Massachusetts. This public hearing and all the work we have done since last January has been geared toward meeting that date, and we are fairly well on schedule.

Following this hearing, we will be required to review all the comments that are made, both here in person and both here and in letter form, and respond to those comments in the final Environmental Impact Statement, and the Governor, Secretary Salvucci and I will then have to decide on exactly what we're asking the Federal Highway Administration to participate in. In other words, we're going to have to make a decision that, yes, there will be a third harbor tunnel; yea, this is the most appropriate tunnel; or some other, yes, we can do widening of the Central Artery; no, we don't

intend to. Those are the decisions that we must make, and it's in this kind of forum that we have the added comments to make the decision.

In the draft of our Environmental Impact Statement, there are two alternatives that are carried over from the original draft, which was completed last January, concerning the Third Harbor Crossing. Two alignments for a Third Harbor Crossing proposed ending or passing through Maverick Square and the railroad yards at East Boston. Those have been dropped from consideration. They're still in the draft, but they, as a statement of the supplement that we've prepared, we're saying that these will not be considered any further. Also it has been decided in the recent passing of the Central Artery, we have decided since our writing the Environmental Impact Study that widening the existing elevated structure, widening what is now there to provide increased capacity is not doable and will not be considered further.

Now at this point, I think I would like to call upon the Undersecretary Mat Coogan, who will give a brief, and I do mean brief overview of the options that we consider as being still alive for

both the Third Harbor Crossing and the Central Artery.

UNDERSECRETARY COOGAN: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

We are here today to discuss the adequacy of a book, in fact it's two books, the Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate 90, EIS, and the supplement, the drafting I guess of the drafting to that EIS. We're here to discuss them together. There are six possibilities for action. The Governor could choose any one of the six programs. Actually there are five build proposals and one design modification to one of the build proposals. I would like to describe them to you now.

In writing the EIS, we usually call the first option the do nothing option, or the no build option. In Option 1, we do not depress or widen the Central Artery. In Option 1, we do not build a Third Harbor Crossing. However, it is not fair to say that the no facility option means do nothing or don't construct anything. The reason for this is that the bridge decks of the existing Central Artery must be replaced in the next ten to 15 years. Recently we replaced the bridge decks on the

Mystic River Bridge and the access road to the Mystic River Bridge. Starting in the next construction season, we will replace all of the bridge decks on the Southeast Expressway.

It is a matter of public safety, and a matter over which we have very little control, that the bridge decks, the existing surface of the Central Artery, must be replaced in the next ten to 15 years. This means that there is no such thing as an option where there is no construction impact in downtown Boston. It would take approximately three years to reconstruct the existing Central Artery, and during those three years, one lane at a time would be lost and replaced in various ways either by temporary reconfiguration of other lanes, or the use of critical highway segments near the Charles River. One lane would be lost to traffic. This process of reconstruction of bridge decks, as I say, would take about three years and have some relatively significant traffic impacts and necessarily environmental impacts would follow.

So Option 1 is described in the book some times as a no build option. There is no no build option. It is called the redecking option. That is

Option 1.

Moving now to the elternativas in which either the Central Artery is depressed or e Third Harbor Crossing is built or both, et this point in the EIS the Governor is free to choose any of the alternatives in the book. Let me see if I can describe them to you.

The Governor could decide to depress end widen the Centrel Artery and not build a Third Harbor Tunnel. This option is described in the book and the public matarial made up from the text of the book. This option is described as Option 6.

In Option 6, the existing six-lane Central Artery, which is eleveted from Causeway Street to the existing Oewey Squere Tunnel, the existing Centrel Artery, which hes six lanes of route traffic, would be taken down end replaced by the new facility, underground, thet hes eight through lanes of traffic, but its actuel physical configuration would heve ten or 11 lanes of travel because of the use of acceleretion lanes and deceleration lanes. Becsuse of the use of acceleration lanes and deceleretion lanes, a new eight-lane capacity roadwey would be built underground from Causewey Street in the

North Station aree to a point where it would meet the existing Oewey Squere Tunnel.

The existino Dewey Square Tunnel, however, is only six lanes. It is our policy end desire to increase the capacity to et least eight lanes. For this reason, the northbound treffic would be served by a new four-lane northbound tunnel, which would stert in the south bey in the generel vicinity of the Herald Travelar Building and proceed through tne south bay, along the westernmost well of the Fort Point Chennel, going under Summer Street and Congress Street, and rejoining the trunk of the Central Artery at around Oliver Street. Four lanes of northbound treffic would go through the new northbound tunnel in the Fort Point Chennel. The axisting Dewey Squere Tunnel would operate with ell six lanes ooerating southbound.

Thet is the most besic description of Option 6, which is widen end depress the Central Artery, but do not build e Third Harbor Crossing.

There are two options in wnich a Third Harbor Crossino is built and the Artery is not depressed. Let's look at those

The two options toward building a Third

Harbor Crossing without the Central Artery are called Option 5 and Option 3. These alternatives were carried over from the original draft Environmental Impact Statement, which was published last Oecember. These two options, as I said, do not have a depressed Centrel Artery, but eech of these options hes a four-lene tunnel, leaving the Fort Point Channel area up et the Northern Avenue Bridge, and taking an S-like shape, to come out at the Jeffries Cove erea of East Boston. That would come up on airport land.

The difference in the two tunnel options is that in one case, Option 3, the tunnel utilizes a split alignment from the Fort Point Channel. This means thet northbound traffic only goes to the Fort Point Channel, and southbound traffic goes through the existing Oewey Square Tunnel. In the case of the third option, split elignment, we cell that Option 3.

In Option 5, both southbound end northbound treffic, or traffic tp end from the eirport, would go in one new tunnel to the Fort Point Channel. That is Option 5, which has a two-direction tunnel to the Fort Point Chennel.

Option 3 has one direction in the new Fort Point Tunnel, and one direction to the Oewey Squere Tunnel. It snould be noted that Option 3 hes one flying ramp to the Fort Point Channel, over the Fort Point Channel and the Summer Street Bridge, and Option 5 hes two flying ramps, flying over the Fort Point Chennel in the vicinity of the Summer Street Bridge.

So if the Governor decides to build a tunnel only, and not depress the Artery, he could choose Option 3, the split elignment, or Option 5, the two-way tunnel.

The next option is the full built. In the full built, the Governor could opt to build both a widened end depressed Artery end a new tunnel. Option 3A is simoly the Third Harbor Tunnel Option 3 with the widened end depressed Cantrel Artery edded to it. It is e cherecteristic of Option 3A thet it has the solit alignment through, with the northbound treffic in the Fort Point Channel, and the southbound traffic in the Centrel Artery, and egain utilizing the Jeffries Cove alignment, coming up at the erea of the Butler Aviation building in the airport in East Boston. It is the nature of both of these

options that the toll facility is located here at the tunnel entrance at Logan Airport. This is the case for three and five, and this is the case for 3A and 5A. So Option 3A has a split Fort Point Channel alignment and a depressed Central Artery.

We move now to Option 5A. Thank you. Moving to Option 5A, we find that again the same widened and depressed eight-lane Central Artery, which is sometimes wider for acceleration and deceleration lanes, is matched this time not with one of the tunnels that we inherited from the previous, but a new tunnel, a new alignment for the Third Harbor Tunnel. Option 5A is the original seaport access road alignment. In this case, the Third Harbor Tunnel does not go through the Fort Point Channel. Rather it follows an alignment which continues Interstate 90, continues the Massachusetts Turnpike to the area next to the Gillette Razor Company, across some land owned by the Boston Wharf Company, some land owned by the United States Coastal Service, Summer Street, into some land largely owned by Massport, going out next to the pier end line of Pier 5, the Commonwealth Pier. Option 5A has one new highway interchange to allow

the traffic to go to and from the tunnel from Northern Avenue, and to and from the east and west, also from Northern Avenue, with an intersection at Congress Street. That is Option 5A.

During the process of developing Option 5A, many meetings were held in East Boston, and meetings were held in South Boston, to examine certain design constraints associated with Option 5A, and so the Environmental Impact Statement, the draft Environmental Impact Statement we have before you today includes reference to design modifications to the basic concept of 5A. I would like to describe those design modifications to you.

In Option 5A, design modification, the seaport access alignment -- and I don't think many of you can see this, but trust me -- the seaport access alignment does not follow a straight line and go out under the Commonwealth Pier. In fact, it goes to a location for a second interchange in the general area of the Massport Third Conte ner Port. It goes under water, and a relativaly short 3,000-foot segment, under Boston Harbor, and comes up under the Bird Island Flats project of Massport. It stays in formation behind the Flats project, the

airport portion of the Flats project. It stsys beside the glass wall, touchea the East Reservation Center, and joins the existing roadway of the Logan Airport. The location of the tolling facility has been moved to the Commonwealth Flats area, owned by the Massachusetts Port Authority.

At this time, there is one interchange serving Northern Avenue, and a second interchange, going only to the south and the west, serving Summer Street and Northern Avenue industrial areas.

To make clear the difference then in the design modification, the 5A design modification does not come up in Jeffries Cove. It comes up in the Bird Island Flats project, snd then ties back into the airport. Further deaign modifications at the airport include the fact that several design changes have been made to minimize impact on the stadium area. All of the tunnel ootions up to the 5A modifier have an at grade service road, which waa perceived by some to cut off access to the stadium area. That service road has been delated in the 5A modified, and a ramp, which would fly over the existing ramps in the vicinity of the MBTA station has been deleted, and further design

modificationa have been made that allow this particular design to end up with a stadium/public recreation area, which is larger than the stadium/ recreation area which is there right now.

That concludes a brief dascription of what the alternatives are. The alternatives have been examined in terms of air quality, water quality, displacement, and let me make the last important point about displacement and relocation.

There is not one single home taken in any of the six options under consideration today. I repeat: there is not one single home taken in any of the six options that are under discussion today.

These six options are examined in terms of air qusility, noise, water, social implications, archeology. I am not going to go into those. However, as the day goes on, if you have any queations about the evaluation of theae alternatives and the substance of that evaluation, members of the consulting team which put together these 22 books -- yes, 22 separate documents -- the members of the team that put together the books are here to answer your questions in specific.

So that is a brief definition of the

alternatives that are under consideration today. If you have questions that are specifically technical, what we will now be doing, staff people will be helping us take these down and put them around the room, and any time during the meeting, assuming we're all quiet for whoever is testifying, you can go up to them and ask specific questions. We have staff here today, some members of the consulting team and the Department of Public Works will be able to answer specific questions at these boards. So that is how we will proceed from here.

Commissioner Tierney.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Secretary Coogan.

I want to talk to you very briefly again about where we are in the process. This is called in Federal highway and State highway parlance a corridor public hearing. The term "corridor" is important, because it implies, and in fact promises, that if the decision is made on a particular corridor to build a transportation facility, then the building facility, the State Department in this case, must come back when design issues are presented much more clearly to a design public

hearing. What you are seeing today are some fairly detailed recommendations for alternatives, and fairly detailed impact on public property. If in the next few years a decision is made on some of these corridors, we will be back with very detailed designs as it affects public and private property, and as it affects the city, Boston, in general.

Regarding the department's policy towards land taking, Secretary Coogan noted that there are no residential, no homes, no individual homes being taken under any of these plans. A number of the options, the alternatives, do effect industrial/commercial buildings, however, and I want to say very briefly what the State and Federal policy is with regard to right-of-way takings.

Federal and State law require us to compensate fully for any property taken for a transportation project. All affected property owners will be reimbursed for the full fair market value of their property. In addition, the Department of Public Works Right-of-Way Bureau provides specialized assistance to each individual property owner and affected business. If this project goes forward when the plans are finalized,

D.P.W. staff will interview each business owner and tenant to inform them of all available aid, discuss relocation procedures, answer questions, and generally help people to get situated. They will be given a detailed report on each business. Businesses to be replaced have available moving expenses. We have with us two members of the Right-of-Way Division, Mr. Michael Mahoney and Mr. Nicholas Giasullio. Will you stand up? Will be available to answer questions you have on State and Federal right-of-way procedures.

Now I want to get to the formal, the public part of this presentation. I know that the presentation that Secretary Coogan gave is about as broad a transportation project as Boston has ever seen. This is the biggest transportation problem facing the city since someone decided to build the elevator. It is even bigger than that. We don't expect you to absorb everything Mr. Coogan said, but we will have all of these graphics brought down on the floor, and people from our engineering firms and the department will be prepared to answer questions.

So if in your testimony you ask a specific

question, I will, rather than answer it myself, probably refer you to one of the people along the sides and the back wall who will try to answer that question in detail.

I will repeat myself again. We will be calling speakers who have signed up, and ask you to testify on the sign-up sheet, and we're asking each of those speakers to confine their remarks to eight minutes. If you haven't signed up yet and want to sign up to speak, go to the back of the hall. Try to get on the list. If there is no time on the list, we have free time, free for all time, from three in the afternoon to seven at night, and from nine in the evening to 11 in the evening on both days.

Again if you don't feel like speaking, you may submit written comments to the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston. As long as your comments are dated August 22nd or earlier, they will be considered as much a part of the public hearing as if you had spoken here at the table.

I am going to go to the sign-up sheet now. How are the acoustics at the back of the hall? Am I

fully understood back there?

The first speaker, I would like to ask each speaker to come and sit at the table. If you would like to address your remarks to the audience, you can do that, too. We like each speaker to identify himself or herself.

Our first speaker is Arthur Osborne.

MR. OSBORNE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of this Commission.

I am Arthur Osborne. I am the president of the Massachusetts AFL-CIO Council, representing the AFL-CIO members across the State of Massachusetts.

The State of Massachusetts today faces important transportation decisions, which will directly effect all of our lives and the economic life of the entire region for decades to come. Those decisions involve the traffic log jam on the Central Artery, a log jam that threatens to go to such proportions that it will choke off the City of Boston, and with it the region.

I speak to you today as a representative of organized labor in this state, representing over 400,000 members of the AFL-CIO, as well as a resident of this area who is concarned about the

futura of our state and of New England.

As you know, jobs are a concern to us, particularly in these times of high unemployment. These projects are very important to us in terms of the short-term, immediata construction jobs that will result, and the thousands of other ripple-effect jobs crested when thosa workers add to the economy by buying more houses, more cars, and more clothas for their families, but we are also concerned about the long-term lasting economic impacts which will result from tha building of these battar roadways and the continued economic growth that they promise.

If plans to widen and depress the Central Artery and to build a Third Tunnel proceed, the short- and the long-term benefits to New England will be enormous. Not only is a combination of the two projects expected to improve traffic flow by as much as 65 percent, allowing our economy to continue and grow and prosper; it will generate an estimated three and one-half billion dollars in regional economic spin-off. This ten-year two billion dollar project will require as many as 5,000 construction workers each year and lead to nearly 10,000 permanent jobs in new developments. When completed,

the Artery will create 20 acres of developable land downtown, as well as greatly increasing access and development potential in East and South Boston and in the outlying communities.

Massachusetts needs these roadways. It needs these jobs. It needs this two billion dollars. And more than that, it deserves it, that two billion dollars.

This present Artery was built almost entirely with State and local funds, and for decades it has been used as an interstate and has carried interstate traffic. This is our last chance to get the 90 percent Federal funding we need to insure the continued economic vitality of this region. We in the AFL-CIO hope the Federal Highway Administration will approve these plans and give our State the funding it needs to build these roads and to continue to grow and prosper into the next century and beyond.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Osborne.

Our next scheduled speaker is Anna DeFronzo.

Excuse me. If you have a prepared speech, a text, if you could leave it with our stenotypist, it would help our accuracy of the records, if you don't mind.

MS. DeFRONZO: I didn't expect to get called this fast.

I am Anna DeFronzo. I live at 12 Lamson Court in East Boston in the Jeffries Point area.

For the last ten years or more, there always have been plans for a Third Harbor Tunnel in the community on Bremen Street. After the loss of many homes and families and businesses because of the Sumner and Callahan Tunnels, many of us have fought the building of another tunnel.

About two years ago when money was asked for and given for another study for a third tunnel again, Bremen Street was included with other plans into the Jeffries Point Cove on Bird Island Flats and also taking a part of the East Boston stadium. Again that was a No-No, and we fought.

The Cove and the stadium are very important to the people of East Boston. I believe there will be a third tunnel sooner or later. If not now, maybe down the road eight or ten years from

now, and again there will be another study, and again it will include Bremen Street and in the community. That's why I favor the new proposal for a third tunnel, because it will be on the other side of Bird Island Flats on the airport, not in the community, not in the Jeffries Point Cove, and not touching the stadium. Thank you, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

Our next scheduled speaker, and we are running a little ahead of time, is Ken Rezendes, and then following him is Walter Ryan. So you will prepare to come up and save time.

MR. REZENDES: I am Kenneth R. Rezendes, President of K.R. Rezendes, Inc. of Assonet, Massachusetts, and Chairman of Construction Industries of Massachusetts, Inc., an association representing over 200 companies engaged in the heavy and highway construction business in our state. I am here to speak in support of the proposal before us today, that Massachusetts construct as a joint project one of the most far-reaching, imaginative transportation proposals made in this state in the past 30 years: a depressed Central Artery, a Third Harbor Tunnel,

including a Seaport Access Road, all designed to advance the cause of better transportation in the Boston area, and all designed to finally untangle one of the worst traffic problems that exists anywhere in the United States.

We understand that no one is going to be very surprised that a construction spokesman is here before you supporting a construction project. What we think is important to say, though, is that CIM has learned through 62 years of long experience to rally to the public interest, and to resist the possibility of short-term gains from relatively insignificant work in favor of the long-term rewards that are to be gained from building projects essential to the public interest for years to come.

This brings us back to the Tunnel/Artery projects. We are for them both. We are for the Tunnel if the Artery is not possible, and we are for the Artery if the Tunnel is not possible. We know that both parts of this project are subject to decisions made by the Federal Government, and we know that every one of those decisions is problematical. A few months from now, we may have federal approval of both, federal approval of only

one, or federal approval of neither. If the federals approve the Tunnel only, or the Artery only, then we should build it.

Again we come back to the public interest. The fundamental problem with traffic in Boston, as has been pointed out so clearly in the EIS, and as should be obvious to anyone who has ever tried to negotiate a vehicle through downtown traffic, is the severe congestion that exists between Dewey Square Tunnel and the Charles River. Building a Third Harbor Tunnel to Logan Airport would reduce a great deal of that congestion; depressing and widening the Central Artery would do a great deal more. Backing out of the Tunnel/Artery commitment, and using the money for other street and transit work, accomplishes nothing and will leave the horrendous traffic problem which even now paralyzes the City.

Backing away from either commitment, be it the Tunnel or be it the Artery, is backing away from what everyone identifies as the fundamental transportation problem in the Boston area. Transferring the money instead into projects such as fixing intersections and repairing MBTA tracks is not in the public's best interest in terms of

priorities. A decade ago, we had an administration in power in this state that faced the same fundamental problem. What can be done to improve transportation in Boston? That administration had the opportunity to solve it through a visionary but politically dangerous program that could have given us one of the most modern and efficient highway systems in the world. They failed to do it: They bowed to political expediency and built nothing, leaving us with only a lot of promises about what mass transit was going to do in the future. We're still waiting. And we're still strangling in traffic day after day paying the penalty for an administration's loss of nerve a dozen years ago.

We would hate to see this sort of history repeat itself. Whatever is done about the Tunnel/Artery proposal must direct itself at the fundamental problem we are trying to solve. Both the Tunnel and the Artery should be built. If the Federal Government will help us build one of them, then we should take the money and build it. If we have to build one ourselves, then we should explore ways that will allow us to do that.

Above all, we must not lose courage and our

sense of direction. We must not lose sight of our fundemental prupose. And finally, we must not lose sight of the public interest, however eesy and tempting it might seem to do so.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Our next scheduled speeker is Walter Ryen.

MR. RYAN: Mr. Cheirmen and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to be here todey, es I have over the yeers and in several circumstances. I hope that the results of these heerings will be a little more helpful to the Commonweelth then many of those I have eppeared before in the past. I might identify myself as Walter J. Ryan, representing the Operating Enginners, Locel 4. I am also speeking es Chairmen of the Transportetion, the State Labor Cpuncil, as President Arthur Osborne you heve also heard here, and also I am the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Highway Transportation Cpuncil pf Massachusetts.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, summaries of the harbor crossings end summaries of the Cantral Artery.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: May I interrupt you

for e minute? I think if you speak closer to the microphone. I think people are heving troubla understanding both you and me.

MR. RYAN: That is about as close as I can get. How is that going?

Well, what I would like to point out, I was going to raed from these summaries, but I guess the time allotted to speekers won't permit that. There is one reference I would like to meke, and that is on the summery of the harbor crossing. It makes note of this: "The written comments postmarked not later than November the 14th, 1972 will be made part of the official record."

There we are, gentlemen, more than ten years leter. We're still talking about a Third Harbor Crossing. We're still talking ebout the Centrel Artery, e summary of which I have here, and, as a matter of fact, we could heve telked about many other highways throughout the state, building those, I-95, for instance, North and South, 128, 495, Routes 3, 2, 24 -- you name it.

If the Commonwealth hadn't met the deedline before the yenkee growth end the environmental attitudes came into play, this

Commonweelth would be in a very sad state. Imagine what we would be in today if we did not have the extension of the Messachusetts Turnpike from 128 into Boston, and how we must wonder how we ever failed to build I-95 from Route 21 into Boston. Imagine what that would heve meant to the commuting public once the Southeest Expresswey restoration begins.

I was talking to some people in the field of puolic health just the other day, cnc tney havc the intention of attempting to shift the emphasis from the construction of prisons to the constructipn of facilities to care for the mentally ill, resulting from those who are trying to cope with the Southeast Expresswey when it is under construction.

I take that for whet this Commonwealth needs is more employment. We cannot get more employment, we cannot get more jobs unless we have the transportetion facilities that feed into the arteries of the Commonwealth. We need a third harbor crossing. We needed it ten or more yeers ago. We need a depressed Central Artary. We needed it ten and more yeers ago.

Will we be meeting again ten years fror

now talking about the same matters and wondering why it was thet nothing was ever done of a substantial nature to alleviate the traffic problems of Greater Boston? We're not telking just about Greater Boston. We're talkino about the entire Commonwealth, and in fact, we're talking about New England.

I would hope, Mr. Cheirman and gentlemen, that the ultimate results of these heerings will not be more hearings ten years from now, but rather would be a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the opening of the Third Harbor Crossing and the depression of the Centrel Artery.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

I will still go by the schedule of speakers. Sal Venezia is next. Is he here? And following him, Oan Prigmore.

MR. VENEZIA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and ladies end gentlemen. My name is Sal Venezia. I em resident of East Boston for the pest 35 years.

I would like to more or less pinpoint end inform the people of the audience here in reference to the community, the East Boston community, who

have been said by the media that we are antagonists, and we always fight for different proposals that come up in our neighborhood. Justifiably, yes, we fought. I fought shoulder to shoulder with them, and I think more or less figure in with reference to what I am talking about. It was in reference to the expansion of Logan Airport. Also the taking of Wonderland Park. With that came the 725 feet of Neptune Road, which automatically brought about the unlivable conditions in which 50 homeowners and 180 tenants had to be relocated. Then came the fight with the trucks on Maverick Square, with the Maverick Street mothers. Also the proposal about the containerizer system at Piers 1, 2 and 3 and 4 at Maverick Square, which automatically would have brought about the building of the elderly housing, which is now a reality, called the Heritage Complex.

However, all these things have come about, yes, and we did fight, and we fought hard. Some we won; some we lost; some was a draw.

Back ten years ago, a proposal of the harbor tunnel came about again, and at that time we opposed it. After consideration and many discussions and meetings, we found that the community felt if

Logan Airport would accept this tunnel in their ball park, we, the community, would go along with it. However, at that time Director Ed King would not accept our proposal. That we won. The third harbor tunnel never came about, and this is one of the reasons we are here today.

In reading the impact study of this Third Harbor Tunnel and the depression of the highway and the way it has been proposed and the way I understand it, it is my opinion it's the best thing that could ever happen to our community. You may say why. I am made to understand that between 50 and 55 percent of the traffic coming out of the tunnel is related to airport traffic. If the Third Harbor Tunnel will come along, and it will be dropped off at Logan Airport, that means between 50 and 55 percent of that traffic will not be invading our territory, will not be parading our city streets, and, yes, the most important, the environmental impact, especially the people in that particular area in reference to pollution.

It is my opinion at this time that I am in favor of both the Harbor Crossing and the depression of the Artery.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Venezia.

Is Dan Prigmore here? The way I am doing this, if you signed up to speak, I will call you. If you're not here, I will substitute you with someone who signed up first.

Joseph Cinserulli is signed up. If he is here, he is welcome to speak.

MR. CINSERULLI: Thank you, gentlemen. My name is Joseph V. Cinserulli. I am a resident of East Boston, also a member of the East Boston Land Use Council.

Although the people of East Boston consider our position when it comes to a Third Harbor Crossing, obviously we've had second thoughts with a Third Tunnel that really doesn't affect us by coming out on to the Bird Island Flats. However, we do ask this committee to give us certain guarantees, if I may ask for them. It's about air impact, the air pollution impact, about the continuance of the existing tunnel on to C-1.

Now we speak about the Third Harbor Crossing terminating at the terminal building, and

then continuing on existing roads to C-1. It doesn't sound feasible, because I can see two or three years down the road the same committee, the people of East Boston, coming head-to-head once again, because at that time they will be proposing extending or widening the roads of C-1 onto I-95.

I would ask this committee give the people of East Boston not words, but written guarantees that this won't happen, that this is the end. We had a first harbor crossing that was going to solve all our problems. We had a second harbor crossing that was the end. And now we have a third harbor crossing.

The people of East Boston, rightfully so, have a right to be suspicious of all harbor crossings. That is what is happening here. They're suspicious of all herbor crossings. Whether it affects them or not, they feel it will not be the end. They have been impacted by the airport, and they have been impacted by the tunnels, and impacted by all things that can happen to all people. We talk about human rights and we talk about the public. They are the public. They have the right to live in dignity. That's what we're asking this committee to

put into the records: that there will be no further encroachment of East Boston in enlarging the highway so the traffic now using this tunnel will now have access to C-1 without any interference. We're asking you to say this is where it's going to end, and at least give us something, some guarantees that say it's over for you people. You have had all you're going to have. That is why I am here today, to ask you to include this in your records, stating that this is the end for the people of East Boston. They have had all they can take. We're not asking too much.

All these union leaders and business leaders who live in the suburbs, coming into our town and tell us what is good for us. I think we know what is good for us. I think we understand that progress has to go on, not always at our expense. Please let it end now. We're going to urge you once again to put it in the records that the Third Harbor Crossing, we are talking about the one that comes up on Bird Island Flats, and doesn't encroach on East Boston, no homes you take, and tell us this is it, and give us some guarantee that four or five years down the road that the people affected

if it is going to happen, be able to collect such a tremendous amount of money for their property that it won't happen. Give us some rights. You have taken all our rights away as far as noise, environmental impacts.

What I am asking once again is put something in that guarantees the people of East Boston something in the future. Again I want to thank you for allowing me to speak out of turn, and I hope you will consider what I had to say.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Cinserulli.

Carl Spillane signed up to speak. Is he here? Mr. Spillane.

MR. SPILLANE: For the record, my name is Charles F. Spillane, General Agent, Secretary and Treasurer to the Boston Building Trades.

At the outset, I would like to state that we in the Building Trades are for anything that goes up or down. We build. We built it the last two times. We built the Mystic River Bridge. We worked on all the highways and central arteries, for both north and south, and I must say we do an

excellent job.

I would like at this time, and I'm not in the habit of boosting the editorials of The Boston Globe, but in this morning's Boston Globe there is an editorial, and I'm not going to bore you by reading it -- I know you are going to have a tough day today and tomorrow, and I admire your guts -- but I am going to present this to the stenographer. This has the dos and the don'ts of the artery and the tunnel, and I do hope when the final decision made that the good people of East Boston will be satisfied.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Spillane.

Our next scheduled speaker is Dan Prigmore. If he is not here, Tom Evers has signed up to testify. Mr. Evers?

If you went to speak, and you're not on the list, you can see we're running into people who signed up late to speak. Be my guest to sign up if you want.

MR. EVERS: Mr. Chairman, my name is Thomas G. Evers, Jr., president of the 90,000-member

Massachusetts Building Trades Council, and I am here today to testify in favor of the tunnel and the depression of the artery.

I would like to say that in keeping with your eight-minute schedule, I don't have a -- I am going to discard my written brief on it.

One of the considerations, probably the most important consideration of the Massachusetts Building Trades and their members, contrary to some people's belief, is not the temporary jobs that are provided by this project or any other project. The first consideration that the Massachusetts Building Trades takes into account on a project like this is the displacement of residents and working people and their families. It is my understanding there will be no displacement of residents on this project. Therefore, we would like to go on record saying we are in favor of the depression of the Central Artery and in building the tunnel.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

Is Mr. Prigmore here?

Mr. Louis Russo has asked to speak. Mr. Russo?

MR. RUSSO: I am Louis Russo, an East

Boston resident.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it seems clear to me from these hearings that alternative 5A modifier is being focused upon. Can we assume at this point that SA modified is the plan which will be submitted to the Federal authorities?

COMMISSION TIERNEY: I think in this particular forum, which is a draft environmental corridor hearing, we can't say at this point which is going to be the alignment selected. The main reason we're here today is to get testimony on the alignments that are preferred by the people, and following that, we will have to make that decision.

MR. RUSSO: Do you think something like alternative 6 has even a ghost of a chance? Isn't it quite clear in your own minds that SA modified is going to be the plan?

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I think SA plan is a reasonable alignment. Yes.

MR. RUSSO: It seems that way, too. All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, please, signed up to speak. Mr. Sullivan is here? Lawrence Sullivan? Don't run.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Excuse me for a minute. On the schedule that was made up prior to the hearing, we have Mr. Prigmore, Mr. O'Leary, Mr. Morris all scheduled in the next half hour. I also have room for other people who want to testify. All they have to do is go back and sign up.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I am Lawrence Sullivan, Executive Secretary for the Greater Boston Labor Council, AFL-CIO. We're just here to speak in support of this whole concept. As for our opinions of which option is the best or not, we leave that to the engineers, environmental people and all the rest of you, and we leave that to the Governor and his men to submit the best plan.

We have no objection to any of the plans. We are behind it, and we have been for years and years.

I also am Director of the Government Land Bank. I don't want that to come into your thinking, because eventually we'll have a role in this, above and beyond the land takings, the relocation of business, commercial and working people. But we just

want to be here for the Greater Boston Labor Council, all the unions that are involved here. Not just the building trades, but we have all the other unions. We have people that work in the hotels. We have people that work at Edison. We have them all.

We think this whole concept is necessary. We think that the time has come, and now that the rest of Boston is built up, let's get the traffic in and out of it. We think that the -- I am very pleased, incidentally, very pleased to hear the residents of East Boston come and speak in support of this. I think this neighborhood should be considered, the fact that they have studied it and all that. We in labor are very pleased to have their support.

I'll leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

While we're waiting for speakers, I want to remind you if you have any questions that have to do with the graphics that are on the wall concerning any of the alignments, we have people who are sitting around doing nothing, waiting to be asked questions. They would be happy to answer your questions. Those are the people to ask. They are

very familiar with the project, and they know all the project alternatives in relation to the various land rights. They're there for your purposes to use.

I think we'll have a five-minute recess.

(A short recess was then taken.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I am getting ready to reconvene the hearing. My name is Robert Tierney, Commissioner of the Mass. Department of Public Works. We're into our, halfway to our second hour. We started shortly after 11 o'clock. We have a predetermined schedule of speakers. We're asking each speaker to limit their testimony to about eight minutes. Anyone here who wants to speak who isn't on the original schedule, just go to the back of the room, and you can practically sign up for eight minutes in the next half hour or less. If you are here and you don't want to testify, you don't want to speak at all, your written testimony will be acceptable just as much as the oral testimony. You must provide that in writing to the Mass. Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston within two weeks.

Our next scheduled speaker is Dan Prigmore

If he is here, please come up.

MR. PRIGMORE: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner. I am Daniel Prigmore, President of BOSCOM.

As a resident of the city, and on behalf of the Fidelity Group, I would like to applaud this latest proposal to address the future transportation needs of the state.

Over the past decade, Fidelity has added over a thousand employees to our Boston headquarters, and we have invested heavily in downtown Boston real estate. Our plans for this next decade are a function of the public sector's ability to address problems such as access to the city and the airport.

Our BOSCOM project anticipates bringing hundreds of thousands of visitors to our computer and communications market center at Commonwealth Pier. The visitors' willingness to return to BOSCOM depends on his ability to get in and out of the city and to move around the region.

For the developers laying plans in the Fort Point Channel area and the residents of South Boston, this plan provides an integrated approach,

which provides access without the risk of overloading the residential streets. This is a well thought out plan which deserves our support, and I believe the support of all residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Prigmore.

Beverly James, if you would come up to speak.

MS. JAMES: I didn't realize I was going to be on quite so soon. I thought it was three this afternoon.

I represent General Services Administration, a Federal agency. We're the owners of the Appraisal stores on Northern Avenue.

We would like to register our opposition to Alternative 3A. We have just invested 3.5 million dollars in Phase 1 of renovating that building for general purpose Federal agency use, and we're about to award contracts in another two months for Phase 2, which is another five point million dollars to finish the project. We also have concern as far as some of the other alternatives are

concerned with the location of the vent buildings in the vicinity of the Appraisal stores. We have great concern with that as to the exhaust fumes and so forth.

We're going to go on record in writing, but as I said we are strongly opposed to 3A because that does propose to take the whole building. We would have severe problems with that, plus as I say the capital expenditures we have in the building already.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

Anyone else who would like to speak and may have signed up for three o'clock and four o'clock, here is your opportunity.

If there is no one who wants to speak, I will keep declaring informal recesses.

(A short recess was then taken.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Our next scheduled speaker is James O'Leary. There is a chair waiting for you.

MR. O'LEARY: Commissioner, I wish the trains were running as well on time.

Good afternoon. I am Jim O'Leary,

General Manager of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority.

I am here today to offer my support for Secretary Salvucci's proposal for a depressed Central Artery and a Fourth Harbor Tunnel -- and I say Fourth Harbor Tunnel because the Third Harbor Tunnel is already built. It is known as the Blue Line. The Blue Line was constructed in 1903 and today carries some twenty-five to 30,000 passengers daily from downtown to Logan and points North.

It is important to keep that mass transit link in view when we are examining comprehensive, regional transportation proposals. The Blue Line is a vital part of our transportation network, and we at the MBTA will continue our efforts to see that the Blue Line, which is widely recognized as one of the nation's best downtown-airport connections, remains a viable and efficient service.

So in offering my support for the plan before us today, I am not overlooking the tremendous potential of mass transit, but am really advocating a balanced transportation system that serves the diverse needs of our city and region. Neither mass transit nor the automobile alone can meet those

needs effectively. So while we remain committed to the Blue Line, we admit that it was not meant to -- nor can it -- be a replacement of the desperately needed interstate link that must move millions of tons of freight and thousands of automobiles through our region.

To insure that Logan Airport remains the economic threshold of New England, we need to offer a balanced transportation system. It's because our region lacks that balance that we are here today: and I firmly believe that a depressed Central Artery with an additional Harbor Crossing is the solution.

An additional Harbor Crossing would complement succeasful Blue Line service and greatly enhance the acceaaibility of Boston and Logan. But if cars and trucks are stalled in 12-hour traffic jams on tho Central Artery, the tunnela are useless; we need a new Central Artery at the same time.

The Boston Transportation Planning Review raised this possibility in 1972, when it recommended improved public transportation aa the primary solution to growing regional transportation needs. The MBTA has followed that mandate: Red Line extensiona to Braintree and Alewife, purchase and

upgrade of 250-mile commuter rail network; extensive modernization of transit stations, power and repair facilities; replacement and modernization of rolling stock; Southwest Corridor/Orange Line Relocation Project with eight new stations for rapid transit, commuter rail and Amtrak.

Moreover, our efforts to improve transit were designed to complement the region's highway system, with parking facilities constructed since then for: 2,000 at Alawife; 700 at Quincy Center; 2,000 at Quincy Adams; 1,775 at Braintree; 550 at Wollaston; 990 at North Quincy.

Again, we must move forward with a balanced plan, this time giving our attention to desperately-needed roadway improvements. Mass transportation cannot satisfactorily address all the short-comings of our present road system in the Greater Boston area.

I am confident, not only that this ambitious propoaal will solve the serious tranaportation problem confronting us, but also that its positive impacts on surrounding neighborhoods will far outweigh any inconveniences experienced during the construction of a new artery

and tunnel.

On this point, highway plannera can learn something from the MBTA, which is nearing the completion point of two massive construction projects, the Red Line Northwest Extension and the Southwest Corridor/Orange Line Relocation.

Red Line, $600 million: one of the most technically difficult construction jobs in the United Statea; 3.2-mile twin tunnels bored under congested Harvard, Davis and Porter Squares, whila live above ground continued; extensive community outreach -- with newaletters, community meetings, and countlesa hearings -- kept communitiea involved, minimized disruption.

Orange Line, $792 million: largeat conatruction job in Boston's history; major rail corridor for rapid tranait, commuter rail, and Amtrak built with cooperation of South End reaidenta, maaaive community outreach effort; conatruction went smoothly even at Copley Place site, when the two projects continued within yards of each other; commuter rail service continued despite conatruction.

Secretary Salvucci's proposal can work to benefit Boston's neighborhooda with a similar

community outreach effort.

I hope by now that it does not seem incongruous for the MBTA to be represented at today' heering. We realize we are one part of a diverse transportation network that serves many needs. Just as we have relied on highwey usera to support our projects, we feel comfortable returning that support; because we appreciate the importance of an effective, balanced transportation network.

This artery/tunnel plan will bring us one setp closer to eatablishing such a network.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I will declare a five-minute informel receas.

(A short recesa was then taken.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: We would like to reconvene our brief recess.

Our next scheduled speaker -- if I could have your attention, pleaae -- our next scheduled speaker ia Frank Morria.

Mr. Morria.

MR. MORRIS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I am happy to be here to testify on behalf of both the Artery project and the Tunnel project. As you

know, these have been in the past considered as separate. I think it is one of the great steps forward that we now are viewing these as one project, which is the way it should have been I think a long time ago.

The City of Boston has enjoyed enormous economic success in the past 15 years, but I think we are running the risk of choking on our own success if we don't do something to improve our highway structure, and anyone who drives to Boston knows that the Artery is key to traffic conditions in the city. Any backing up on the Artery is felt in many places throughout the center of the city, and the prospect ten years from now of if we don't do anything about it of closing down one lane on the Artery for repairs for an extended period of time can only be described as grim for the prospects of moving traffic around this city.

Now with respect to the tunnel, I draw your attention to the fact that the close proximity of the airport is a very big plus, economic plus for the city. Any organization contemplating a corporate headquarters here, comparing it to New York or Chicago, would have to conclude that the close

proximity to the airport is a big plus, but it's a big plus only if you can get across the river, and I think that in the long run the economic health of the city will be benefitted immensely from a Third Harbor Tunnel, not only for moving people, but also for moving cargo, because the air cargo out of that airport is growing and has been growing for some years now at the rate of 20 percent per annum plus.

And finally, the fact that the Mayor mentioned yesterday, at least I read it in the paper yesterday, the fact that the new artery project is going to do a great deal to improve the physical asthetics of the city. The present artery cuts the city off from the waterfront. I think the artery project will pay great dividends for the city in enhancing, spurring the development of the waterfront, because the waterfront will no longer be cut off from the main part of the city.

It is also going to generate a stretch of extremely valuable land, which if properly managed, it will pay great dividends to the people of the city. It seems to me there are an awful lot of pluses, and I don't see any minuses.

I think one thing that ought to be kept

under consideration is the fact that the availability of Federal monies for projects of this sort is going to be pretty limited in the years to come. If we miss this opportunity by our inability to get our act together in this town, it may be a long time before the strained Federal budget is going to make these monies available to us again. So it seems to me a case for going ahead with the combined project is very strong, and I am very pleased to have the chance to publicly support it.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Morris.

Our next scheduled speaker is not here yet. We have someone that signed up today, Joseph Ooherty, if he is here.

MR. OOHERTY: Hello, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Joseph Ooherty. I live at 109 High Street in Charlestown, and I think Boston is a beautiful city. In fact, it's the best looking city in the whole wide world. Every time I go down, I am coming from Revere, or from my house -- gee, I am nervous -- I go down the tunnel coming home is always backed up. Every time I think it is backed

up because of the Expressway. It is always jammed, and a lot of times I go over the Mystic Bridge, come into Boston, and always find that backed up. I go to work from three o'clock in the afternoon, and I go through South Boston, and it is only right over the South Station one way, and I have to wait maybe 15, 20 minutes, a half hour, maybe 40 minutes sometimes before I hit I-93 going into Route 3.

I am for the proposal of, you know, changing the system, tear it down, build it, make it wider, and I am for making another tunnel, you know, building another tunnel. I think that would be great. I think it would make Boston a better looking city. It wouldn't be so congested the way it is now. Now it looks like disaster. By the year 2000, all of a sudden if you do a little repair work on it, it is going to be even, you know, worse, ten times worse than what it is now, and I would like to see it be, you know, constructed, and not only that, but it will put a lot of people back to work, especially construction workers.

I am a family man. I pay taxes. I am a homeowner, and I am a registered voter, and I feel as though it's my duty to say a few syllables about

this construction. I am in favor for it.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Doherty.

For those of you who are new and haven't been here for the last hour -- most of you have, I know -- if you want to speak and you weren't on the original schedule, you may speak very shortly by signing up in the back of the room.

Our next scheduled speaker is here to join us.

SENATOR BACHRACH: Thank you, Commissioner. It is good to see you both here. It is also nice to know that members of this administration still work during the month of August. Sometimes we hear the Governor shuts down. I commend you for being here.

I have some written testimony I will leave with you, and I would, rather than read it, just offer some quick points, if I may, and leave the written testimony for the record.

Some people may wonder what a legislator is doing at this meeting not represented in the immediate area concerned, East Boston and the North

End or downtown areas. I do, for the record, represent Allston Heights and Brighton, Wards 21 and 22 of the city, but I am here as much to represent some of the outlying communities. I represent Cambridge, Watertown, Belmont.

There are some obvious reasons for supporting the depression of the Central Artery and building the Third Harbor Tunnel, particularly into the airport, that I suspect have been raised.

First, and most obvious, is the facilitation of traffic that is used in the area; the other issues obviously are esthetics, the fact we have a tremendous eyesore; third, that we have cut off one section of the city from another, and that commerce locally cannot take place as easily as it might. Those are all very important.

I might add that frankly the matter of esthetics is very important, being someone who believes the quality of life in the city is very important. I have always believed that the great "walk to the sea", which has been talked about, joked about, is truly a wonderful thing. The development of the downtown area has with some difficulties worked well and added to the quality of

life.

But I would like to make a special point for the outlying communities. In the Sunday Globe, Representative Mike Barrett wrote I thought a very thoughtful article about his difficulty in convincing suburban residents to play a role in the life of the city. I would suggest to you that those of us who represent outside communities very much believe that we are elected to the hub. I have a district of light industry. That light industry depends, depends critically, upon the ability to get to the airport and from the airport, its goods and merchandise from the marketplace, it depends critically on the artery for commerce into the southeastern portion of the state, down to Rhode Island. We may not be at the heart of the city, but this particular program and the congestion on it is a major factor in the quality of the business life of people not just in the city, but the suburban areas, and I would hasten to say all of New England.

The fact that the present situation blocks traffic at that critical juncture, that you cannot get through, even now, statements about the year

2010, a 12-hour bumper to bumper to bumper traffic is a horror, but the fact is that today is a horror, and the idea of spending millions and millions of dollars to simply rehabilitate the existing anachronism, that is also an eyesore, that also cuts off neighborhoods, I think would just be a travesty. We need to widen the Central Artery as we proposed, and depress it, facilitation of the traffic now is important to the commerce of Boston, but also to the quality of the commerce and the air, and as we know the added pollution of cars waiting in line is also immeasurably worse than if we had a free flow of traffic.

For all of these reasons, I think it is vitally important. For those that live in the immediate area, I would suggest that what is Senator Backrach doing here, he doesn't live in the area, he doesn't understand the disruption of our lives that this would cause, I would say to you that we all have some sense of disruption that doing transportation causes. My immediate part of the world extends itself to Alewife. My constituents in North Cambridge have undergone tremendous difficulty as Harvard Square has been dug up. The

impact on traffic patterns will be severe and will hurt, but in the long term we in the Belmont and Brighton area hope to provide a major benefit to not only our area, but a much larger area.

For that reason, I am here today to support the depression of the Central Artery and widening and hope to proceed with the funding of that in conjunction with the Third Harbor Tunnel. It is important to the city and to my area and a much larger area.

I thank you for this opportunity. My written presentation adds more detail, but I would spare you that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Senator.

I don't believe any of our initially scheduled people are here yet. We have two people that signed up, at least one person. David Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is David Sullivan. I live at 83 Inman Street, Cambridge, and I am an elected member of the Democratic State Committee representing a district which includes East Boston and the North End, and I am appearing this afternoon in opposition to a

Third Harbor Tunnel because I fear its impact both on my constituents and on many others in the metropolitan area.

A Third Harbor Tunnel would increase automobile traffic into and through East Boston, creating additional air pollution and congestion. It would promote the growth of Logan Airport and related services, causing further ill effects on surrounding communities.

While the proposed tunnel alignment onto airport property certainly represents a welcome improvement over earlier plans, it fails to address these wider concerns at all. At a cost of a billion dollars, a third tunnel would not begin to solve the transportation problems which bring us here this afternoon. Much broader solutions are required, and I am pleased to endorse the alternatives proposed by the Coalition Against a Third Tunnel.

Those alternatives are improving the Central Artery, keeping the one-way toll system, capping Logan Airport expansion, improving public transportation, and creating a ferry system. In particular, as someone who does not own a car, I emphasize an often overlooked fact: we already have

a third harbor tunnel, the MBTA Blue Line.

Public resources ought to be used to improve MBTA service and to encourage more people to use the T, not to promote more automobiles in an already congested urban area. In this connection, I must call to your attention that the State Democratic Platform, on which Governor Dukakis was elected last year, expresses a clear preference for, quote, high quality public transportation, end quote, and supports efforts to combat air pollution.

In conclusion, I urge that no third automobile tunnel be built, and that we turn our attention to long-range solutions to these difficult problems. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

I will keep repeating this for people who may have come in recently. If you want to testify on this corridor hearing for the improvements to the Central Artery or a harbor crossing, you may sign up in the back of the hall and testify. If you do not want to testify orally, your written testimony will be included as much a part of the record of this hearing as if you spoke here. With written testimony,

our only requirement is that it be delivered to the Department of Public Works at 100 Nashua Street, Boston within two weeks of today to get the record of the testimony.

Also for any of you who came in beyond my original introduction, we have graphics on both sides of the hall for all of the options that are discussed in our draft Environmental Impact Statement. If you have any specific questions on those graphics, there are people sitting waiting to be asked over there on my left-hand corner. All you have to do is go ask them.

We'll take another five-minute or less recess.

(A short recess was then taken.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I would like to reconvene, call off the recess and reconvene.

Our next scheduled speaker is Barney Frank. Congressman Frank? I said at the beginning this is a formal public hearing, but you don't have to dress formally. You can take off your coat.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate the chance to testify, and I commend you and Secretary Salvucci and the Governor for

making it possible for everybody interested to be heard on this very important subject.

I, like a lot of other people, I have been concerned with various aspects of the program you are talking about today for many years. I am now a member of Congress from a district which does not include either the Central Artery or the proposed Third Tunnel site, although I have not recently checkad with the Massachusetts Legislature, and I am never sure whether it is or is not in my district, but I don't think that they have reached that yet.

I have in the past been opposed to some of the particular aspects of this proposal, partly because they did not seem to me to be part of a well thought out plan, partly because they did not in their individual entities seem to me to offer traffic relief and transportation help adequate to the cost, partly because we did not have, those of us who lived in the city as I did at the time, I think adequate assurance that the projects would be handled with the care that is necessary for something of this sort.

Looking at this total package, however, and in particular at the great care that has been taken

to minimize, absolutely, the disruption that will be entailed here, the commitment to not disturb the people's homes, the commitment to not infringing on important communities, I think that this combined project of depression of the Central Artery and the Third Tunnel that comes up into the airport grounds so it is not disruptive of the community of East Boston is an important project. It is important I think economically, and it is important I think environmentally.

As I said, in the past I have been skeptical of some of the individual proposals, precisely because they were individual proposals and did not in my judgment offer us any relief from traffic congestion and jams. They simply moved it along.

We have for the first time in my memory a total package of proposals here, and I think they're important. Specifically with regard to the tunnel, the commitment to having a tunnel come up inside of the airport, which is the first time I can remember there being an absolute commitment to that effect, goes a long way towards the objective that others have had. It has also occurred to me we have a

commitment to an overall balanced transportation project to rail and other alternatives. As part of this project, I think a third tunnel coming up in the airport and it does not disrupt East Boston is an important one.

As far as the Artery is concerned, I have been concerned for a long time about the cost of depression of the Central Artery. As far as events have shown, and we look at the whole question of the intrastructure, we face a situation where the Artery is sooner or later going to come down. The question is whether we bring it down reasonably or we stand there and let it crumble. We have done pretty well, or that old road has done well by us, but it takes a heavier burden than anticipated.

As part of an integrated scheme that redoes that Artery, increases its capacity, and turns it into a nondisruptive tunnel, gives us the opportunity to lower it. Simply lowering it for the sake of lowering it for esthetic reasons for an undue cost, as part of a package in which it has to get the needed structural work, because we have learned the danger of not doing the structural repair on these kind of things, and tying into the transportation

scheme offers for the first time in 15 years or so that I have been watching this, gives a plan to improve traffic and to improve the environment, and it is obviously the case that the work that would be generated in this particular project will be very important, both to those directly employed and to those that would benefit from spending the money.

I think we have an overall package that makes sense, and I am glad to support it, and if the Commonwealth goes ahead and decides to pursue this particular scheme and request Federal funds, I will be doing what I can to support that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Congressman Frank. Thank you for coming up from Fall River.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK: Thank you for coming down from Fall River.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Our next scheduled speaker right now is Lois Pines.

MS. PINES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Lois Pines. I reside at 40 Keene Road in Waban, Massachusetts. I have been an attorney for almost 20 years, and I was one of the founding members of

the Boston Bar Association Committee on the Environment. I was also one of the authors of legislation which allows private citizens to sue to protect damage to the environment. In addition, I played a role in establishing the first set of air pollution regulations for the greater metropolitan area in 1970.

I have spent many years in the public sector, first on the Newton Board of Aldermen, and then as a representative representing the City of Newton for three terms.

During those terms, I worked to insure that Massachusetts protect its environment and natural resources and do all that it could to protect and improve the quality of life for the people of Massachusetts. I am perhaps publicly known most for my advocacy on behalf of the environment and on behalf of consumers.

I opposed the construction of the Third Harbor Tunnel while I was a member of the Legislature because I believed that the plans that were put forward failed to deal with very serious problems: air pollution, noise pollution, the splitting of the East Boston community, inadequate attention had been

given to the environmental impact of that proposed parcel. Thus I am particularly pleased to be here today to support what I believe is a very well thought out plan to both depress the Central Artery and to construct a Third Harbor Crossing.

I will admit that when I first heard of the proposal to depress the Central Artery, I too was a Doubting Thomas, believing that it was both an unwise expenditure of dollars, but really not possible. As a strong supporter over the years of environmental impact statements, I am pleased to say that having read this latest supplement from cover to cover, I too am convinced that it is not only possible, but that it's a very wise expenditure of dollars of both the Federal government and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

For those who like myself opposed the plan to build a Third Harbor Tunnel, I believe our opposition over the years has borne very great fruits. This plan is innovative. It is sensible. It is sensitive, environmentally sound, and I believe will provide thousands of jobs. But it will also be an economic boon to our region.

From 1979 through June of 1991, I served as

the Regional Director of the Federal Trade Commission's New England office. As such, my office was located at 150 Causeway Street on the 13th floor. I had a bird's eye view of the Central Artery, bumper to bumper, for a good part of the day, every weekday. In fact, the view is very boring. For as far as the eye could see in both directions, one only saw bumper to bumper cars. One day I recollect being interviewed by a reporter from a Boston news station. He encouraged me to use my special vantage point to assist commuters by giving daily traffic reports from my special perch, but it was clear that the daily message would be most repetitive: heavy congestion, frustration, pollution.

In addition, I drove to work daily, always trying to beat the traffic. I came in very early, and I left very late. I used the airport frequently in that my responsibilities required a good deal of travel, not only for myself, but for my staff. Indeed, a good number of staff people from our Washington office of the Federal Trade Commission came to Boston and used the airport. Whoever traveled from Washington to Boston was always aware

of a need to plan in advance to be able to make any date because of the extraordinary congestion and problems that they would encounter with access to and from the City of Boston.

Thus I feel today that I have a special knowledge to bring to this discussion with regard to the serious traffic problems facing Massachusetts commuters, business people using the port, travelers, visitors, and those people who have need for the areas serviced by the Central Artery. I felt personally unsafe in my location at 150 Causeway Street. I constantly apologized to visitors for our physical surroundings, for the derelicts on the street. I spent a great deal of time as the Regional Director of that office trying to get General Services Administration to allow our office to move. I got familiar with the people who worked in that particular building, would not be disappointed if their offices are moved as a result of the depression and widening of the Central Artery. I am particularly worried about my female staff who stayed after hours working on specific programs. I always insisted they take cabs or be picked up by car when those occasions arose. The darkness and

dinginess under tha Central Artery was both depressing and ugly. In fact, I had difficulty hiring people to coma up to work in that particular location. This was particularly so for lawyers. In fact, I couldn't open my windows and talk on the telephone at the sama time becausa tha noise from 13 stories below was so extreme that it filtered up, interfering with my ability to listen to someona on the other end of the telephona.

Boston is a vital and exciting city, with I believe a very great future. The continued existence of the elevated structure which separates neighborhoods and discourages upgrading and casts gloom in tha area renders this part of the city an orphan. I am proud of the revitalization that is taking place in so many sections of tha city, but as long as tha Central Artary remains in placa, North Station, evan with tha construction of tha new Federal building, will not prosper, and it will not effectively compete for private funds for new construction and for rehabilitation.

From an air pollution perspective, from an overall envirdnmental perspective, the depression of the Artery is a must. The economic vitality of the

Port and our Massachusetts economy is conditioned on a relief from traffic congestion, and it demands easy access to our airport. We must plan for a growing city, both visitors, tourists, business people, from all over the world who look to Boston as the international city. We're known across the world for our brain powar, our computer expertise, our innovation, our leadership, our universities, our madical center. How then can we sit back and not solva what now appears to be a very solvable problem: simple access to our city, from our city to the nation, and indeed to the world.

I believa that Secretary Salvucci should be commended for what is a brilliant plan. The Environmental Impact Statement worked on by over a hundred paople provided us with the support that is needed to insure that this plan is workable. The future of the city and the region depends upon this dacision, and I vary much hope that we all do what we can to convince thosa in Washington who are in charge of tha purse strings that monies must be allocated to this project, depressing and widening the Central Artery and buildino tha Third Harbor Tunnel.

I am pleased that Secretary Salvucci has promised and insured evaryona of a continuing opportunity to provide input in the design phase of this project. As with any construction project of this magnitude, I am confident that there will be opportunities for thosa changes that are necessary. Since I have always stood for public participation, I believa that every opportunity must be made available for continued public input, and particularly from the affected parties. During my years as a public person, I have always worriad about government taking advantaga of the small business person, the individual who can not effectively fight the systam. One worry that I continua to have relates to insuring that those whosa property will be taken under this proposal are adequataly compensated.

As a lagislator, I wes unsuccessful in securing passage of legislation which would have required that goodwill ba recompensed if a business was taken in an eminant domain hearing. I would urge Secretary Salvucci to insure that thosa individuals whose unfortunate fate is to ba in tha path of this proposal be treated fairly and

equitably, as if the effected small business were his family's livelihood. There will be a great deal of disruption borne by those whose property will not be taken but who are in the effected area. Loss of business during construction, anguish, and inconvenience. We must assure that a spacial system be put in place to allow for easy access to the actual decision makers by those effected parties.

The good of the Commonwealth I believe demands that this particular project go forward, but we must also insure that the minority who are to be effected by the project who will bear the burden of disruption and dislocation and parhaps relocation for some period of time be given soecial attention and special assistance. I am confident that Secretary Salvucci and the Stata Department of Public Works will do all thay can to insure that this takes place.

I am pleased to have tha opportunity to put forward my remarks, given my involvement with this issue over many years.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

Our next schedulad speaker on the maeting

schadule is Senator Allan McKinnon, if he is here.

SENATOR McKINNON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My name is Allan R. McKinnon. I am the State Senator representing the South Shore communities of Cohasset, Duxbury, Hingham, Hull, Marshfield, Scituate and Weymouth.

I am here today to express my strong support of tha Third Harbor Tunnel/Depressed Central Artery project. This proposad project is vital not only for the continued development of Boston as our core city, but also for those who must travel through the city to points north and south.

The combined project would significantly help ease the traffic burdens of my South Shore constituency.

Several years ago when this project was first proposed, I felt that the monies could be put to better usa. I must admit that I am now a convert. I travel the Southeast Expressway daily and after witnessing the increase in traffic tie-ups on both the northbound and southbound sides of the Central Artery, I firmly believe that its expansion is long overdue. The duration of daily traffic congestion spans from early afternoon hours

to early evening, strangling traffic on this ovarburdaned artery for a mile or more around tha Dewey Square Tunnel.

The Central Artery was built in 1959 to handle a capacity of 100,000 cars. In 1983, the artery serves as Boston's major north/south connector as well as a major route to Logan Airport. Its current average daily capacity is 165,000 cars, and statistics show that this roadway has two and one-half times the national accident rate for urban highways. The present situation discourages day visitors and tourists from coming into the city and deters economic growth.

The traffic congestion is a nightmare now. If plans are not made to move ahead on a depressed Central Artery, within a decade, as traffic continues to increase, travel time for commuters will quadruple. A Third Harbor Tunnel and a widened artery would tremendously improve traffic flow and traffic safety on the Central Artery as well as on numerous highway facilities connecting with it. These facilities service regional through-traffic from the South Shore, downtown Boston, East Boston, Logan Airport and the

North Shore. This is not a local issue. We're talking about an artery connecting interstate highways serving the entire New England area.

The positive ramifications of this project would anhance the economic, environmental, social and esthetic qualities of Boston by: creating long-term jobs; generating forty to seventy million dollars in state income taxes from wages paid during the period of construction; developing the 20 acres of land and air rights which will be made available by depressing the Central Artery; improving traffic flow in East Boston and South Boston; gaining better access to Logan Airport from all points; generating $2 billion in construction activity in the Commonwaalth; diminishing air pollution created by thousands of idling vehicles.

In addition, removal of the divider that now intersects tha haart of Boston and its historic waterfront will certainly impact favorably on the city's community life and esthetic setting.

The Third Harbor Tunnal and the depression of the Central Artery are not mutually exclusive projects. Together, they constitute an integral part of modernizing the transportation network in

and around the City of Boston.

We desperately need relief from this web of vehicular congestion if we are to save the capitol city from strangling in its own traffic. The only way to effectively achieve this is to combine the Central Artery depression with a Third Harbor Tunnel. The need is a critical and obvious one. Secretary of Transportation and Construction Fred Salvucci has my full and enthusiastic support in requesting Federal Interstate Highway Trust Funds for this most vital project.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Senator.

The next scheduled speaker is Judith Kurland. Coming to the witness tabla is Ms. Kurland.

MS. KURLAND: Thank you, Commissioner.

I am hera representing New England Medical Centar, a major academic teaching center in downtown Boston. I am the Director of Public Affairs, and Jerry Grossman, who is the president -- I mantion him because he is also the Chairman of tha Center City Task Force. I am here not only to express our support of tha combined depression of the Central

Artery and the seaport access route for the harbor tunnel, but also to express our interest in what it will do for the whole downtown, and not our narrow interest as a medical center.

Of particular interest to us as a medical center is increased access of emergency vehicles, of access for our patients and their families, and of our staff to the medical center. As much traffic as need not go through downtown Boston and its back streets, the easier it is for those who come to our medical center.

We also are concerned about the effects on our neighbors, and to in particular Chinatown and South Boston seem to benefit from this approach, and I commend you and your staff from going out and talking to people in the communities and get the best in the modified plan.

We do heve, I just want to raise a few concerns, and I am sure you share in our general support of the program. I list them not in order of priority, but in the order they were listed in your supplemental draft statement.

The first is Downtown Crossing. You mentioned there mey be some adverse effects on some

of the cart trade, and I am sure that people already, you and Secretary Salvucci and Mr. O'Leary, are already thinking about how to enhance and bring people so that that will not be disrupted.

The second, I know you are working on, we want to express our shared concern is the interest of the people in South Boston to participate in the planning of the design and to continue to have a role as your plans develop.

I am sure that the same creativity will continue to solve some problems you had a year or more ago, or five years or ten years ago, that have culminated in this very creative and determined plan will be evidenced in your working with the communities to make sure we get the best possible plan to carry this out. We are extremely supportive. I can't praise the efforts too much, and we look forward to having them come to fruition.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Ms. Kurland.

Our next speaker scheduled is Chuck Favazzo. I understand he has a substitute.

MR. UPTON: Good afternoon. My name is

Budge Upton. I am speaking this afternoon in place of Chuck Favazzo. I am with Cabot, Cabot & Forbes.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Could you move a little closer?

MR. UPTON: How is that?

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Fine.

MR. UPTON: My name is Budge Upton. I am with Cabot, Cabot & Forbes, and I am speaking today in place of Chuck Favazzo. I do have several brief comments that I would like to make.

The first is that Cabot, Cabot & Forbes fully supports the full build modified alternative SA for construction of the depressed Central Artery, the seeport access road, and the Third Harbor Tunnel. Specifically, we would like to make a request, and that is that in the final EIS there be some attention given to an anelysis of the traffic impacts on the Congress Street-Northern Avenue Seaport Avenue connector route. Specifically we would ask for some definition of the level of service projections at the connector intersections with Congress Street and Northern Avenue, the traffic volumes on the connector road broken down by truck versus car traffic.

Further, and this is the last point that I

would like to make this afternoon, we would like to acknowledge at this time that we do as a company responsible for the development of a portion of land in that area, we would like to take a further look at the exact location of that seaport access connector with respect to its east-west position. We will be engaging some consultants ourselves to perform some studies to give us some further oerspective on what the implications of various alignments might be and look forward to working with the State as time goes on subsequent to Seotember 30th to further analyze the results.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you. You request that we review traffic in the Congress and Northern Avenue area. Made a pert of these minutes means that we have to look at it.

Our next speaker is David Davis.

MR. DAVIS: My name is David W. Davis, and I am the Executive Director of the Massachusetts Port Authority.

Before I go on with my remarks, Mr. Tierne I would just like to tell you how pleased I am that you are on that side of the desk today, and I am on this side.

We at Massport welcome the opportunity to testify at the public hearing on the Third Harbor Tunnel/Central Artery project.

The planning process for addressing regional transportation needs, in a manner that minimizes community impacts, has been a very long one. But over the last several months, it has been an accelerated and increasingly comprehensive and positive process. We et Massport are pleased that attention has been given to regional traffic problems in both the north-south and east-west directions. In that regard, we are pleased that the long-standing Central Artery and Third Tunnel problems are now being addressed. As I will nota in this testimony, Messport has many concerns, but looks forward to the resolution of these concerns in the preperation of the final EIR/EIS on this project.

It is my view thet the future viebility of several important Messport facilities, which are crucial to tha regional economy, is being sariously threetened by the inability of our current transportetion system to provide the necassary level of ground access. This is true at the commercial/ industrial site in South Boston, where we have many

maritime and development properties, such as BOSCOM, Fish Pier, Massport Marine Terminal, Conley Terminal and others. This is true for Moran Terminal and the Tobin-Mystic Bridge. It is certainly true at Logan Airport where our conservative projection of 40 percent growth in passenger travel during the next two decades cannot possibly be accommodated at a reasonable level of service by todey's barely functional ground transportation system. I do not mean to imply that the passengers will not travel to Logan if access improvements are not forthcoming. We need only look to New York to appreciate the extremes of delay and congestion that air passengers will endure to fulfill their travel needs. What I do mean to say very clearly is that without major improvements in all transportation modes, Boston will surely fall prey to the extreme congestion and delay lavels protrayed in the Environmental Impact Statemant, EIS/EIR, with all of the attendant costs measured in economic losses, increased air pollution, and serious community impacts.

Massport sees the need to improve public transportation to our facilities, and has worked to implement new measures. That is why several years

ago, Massport undertook a study on the effects of major transit extensions on the Logan mode split, i.e. the percentage of people using Logan who arriva or leave by public transportation. We investigated the effects of two Blue Line extensions, one to Charles Street or to Perk Street, and the other from the Airport Station to the Central Mall at Logan. Our study convinced us that good public transportation, as needed as it is, will not do the job by itself. For example, the two Blue Line extensions would change the Logan mode split by three to six percent. That is, the oresent six percent of Logan's passengers using the Blue Line can be increased to nina percent or possibly to 12 percent but not much more. Other public transportation changes will probably result in aven smeller increasas. Henca, wa can say that public transportation solutions by themselves will not be satisfactory and need to be coupled with othar ground access improvemants.

With regard to highways, it is clear to Massport that central artery congestion is now the major impediment to efficient and reliable accass to both Logan and to our development and maritime

properties. Hence, we concur with the draft supplemental report that the essential task in revitalizing our ground transportation networks is the widening and depression of the Central Artery. Without resolution of the artery's limitations, all other improvements considered in the study are seriously handicapped.

Assuming sufficient resources are available, we will need to address both the east-west as well as the north-south traffic problems. For example, I do not think that the improvements to be gained by modernizing the Central Artery alone will be sufficient to meet the demand for travel to Massport's facilities. The successful one-way tolls program has provided strong evidence of the very real improvements in tunnel traffic flows that we can expact from resolution of the artery problem. But even if the existing tunnels could operate at their unconstrained capacity, and if we achieve the benefits of additional transit improvements, we will require additional capacity to serve our facilities. For that reason, I would like to be recorded in favor of a Third Harbor Crossing. However, I am not

prepared to support the selection of any tunnel just for the sake of providing additional capacity. The public discussion of a Third Harbor Tunnel over the past ten years has been plagued by failure to recognize the legitimate environmental concerns of community residents on both sides of the harbor and by failure to recognize the access requirements of the South Boston marine developments. Because of this, prior tunnel proposals have been both politically infeasible and have not served important transportation needs. But there is a proposal that works and Massport can support, i.e. a new tunnel to Logan that also provides efficient access to the commercial/industrial sections in South Boston.

Early in this process, Massport wrote to the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction requesting that the Third Harbor Crossing and seaport access road be seen as one integral package. Massport appreciates the response by EOTC to our request. We are concerned, however, that the seaport access road in alternative 5A does not provide the most efficient solution. In that regard, Massport thinks that the modification of alternative 5A, on page 15 in the draft supplemental

EIR/EIS, is far superior since it allows two access/egress points, for commercial and industrial traffic, and thus, will be much more effective in getting truck traffic off the streets in the residential South Boston community. And that is something which the South Boston residents and Massport both desire.

There is an important public transportation potential in the combined seaport access road and tunnel. A new tunnel and seaport access road should enable us to accommodate additional public transportation vehicles to and from Logan as well as private passenger cars and trucks. For example, the proposed tunnel and roadway system can provide an impetus for new public transportation possibilities from the transportation center in the South Station area to Logan. In conjunction with the traffic relief gained by widening and depressing the Central Artery, it offers the potential to institute new public bus service to other transportation centers, such as North Station and Haymarket Square.

In supporting this tunnel alignment, I would like the record to show that despite its strengths, a number of concerns must still be resolved.

The location of the toll plaza and vent stack at the East Boston Portal as shown in alternative 5A is not acceptable to Massport. Given the extremely congested landside facilities at the airport, I do not feel we can afford to devote additional area to a toll plaze displacing legitimate airport uses to off-airport sites. The proposed location of the toll plaza and vent stack in alternative 5A modified seems to resolve this land use problem while, at the same time, offering substantial improvements in air quality. Although the final environmental impacts of this modified alternative are not yet available, the improvements seem intuitively clear since the relocated toll plaza will be around seven times further away from the closest community sensitive receptor in South Boston than it is in East Boston under alternative 5A. Any impact from the toll plaza will be even further reduced or eliminated since alternative 5A modified includes a one-way toll collection scheme. The reduction in the number of toll booths plus the large distance from the nearest part of the South Boston residential community, over a half mile, will insure that the South Boston residents will not be

exposed to negative impacts due to the relocation of the toll plaza.

There are three other issues that Massport would have the consultants address in the preparation of the final EIR/EIS, which are specifically related to impacts at Logan and Massport's development and maritime properties.

Number one, construction phasing. While we are pleased to work with you, Massport and its tenants need to know precisely the construction phasing of any scheme proposed on Massport properties. It is imperative that full service to and from Logan be maintained at all times in order to provide efficient movement for Logan's tenants and users, and to insure that traffic, during the construction period, does not congest either the airport roadways or the streets in the residential community of East Boston. It is important that the construction impacts on air freight, air passengers, hangers, and roadways be kept to a minimum. It is also important that full access be maintained to all Massport maritime and development properties to avoid truck movements through the residential community of South Boston.

Number two, Logsn roadway system. Third Harbor Crossing should link into the Logan roadway system in s manner that reduces adverse community and environmental impacts, and provides adequate service to Logan users. In order to have efficient traffic flows on the Logsn roadway in both the north/south as well as the east/west direction, it is imperative that grade separation be an integral part of the Third Harbor Crossing construction progrem.

I am also requesting thst my planning and aviation staff provide for the record detailed comments on the possible impacts of the Third Harbor Tunnel on the Logan roadway system that should be addressed in the final EIR/EIS.

Number three, relocstion and disruption costs. It is slso imperative thst Massport have a full assessment of dislocstion snd relocation costs for each part of the construction program. Massport wants any conflicts between the Commonwesith and Mssschusetts Technology Center, Air Freight Facilities, Esstern Airlines, st the reservstions center, the Southwest Terminsl, and air freight ares, or any other Logsn tensnt, be resolved as soon as possible in a equitable and expeditious manner.

Massport also urges that any conflict with the tenants on the maritime/development properties be quickly resolved. For example, the toll plaza on the downtown side, sketched for alternative 5A modified, must be designed in a manner that allows full truck loading docks for Turner Fisheries, and relocates the railroad to the southern part of Commonwealth Flats.

In addition to the specific points raised sbove, Massport slso offers a few comments on one of the wider issues: access flexibility.

We are concerned about the overall desion of the links between the reconstructed Central Artery, the new harbor crossing, and the Sumner/Callahan Tunnels. Massport would like to see all the tunnel connections designed in a manner that provides the Logan users with maximum flexibility, so an alternate route is available in the event that one of the tunnels is congested due to an accident or breakdown. The present designs should be modified to allow for that flexibility. For example, it should be possible to have direct movements between the reconstructed Central Artery and the Callanan and Sumner Tunnels in all

directions, and the sesport access rosd and new tunnel should provide for northbound movement onto the Central Artery.

Let me close this testimony by affirming agsin our support for a reconstructed Central Artery, a new harbor crossing to Logan, and a new seaport access road, with links to both commercial and industrial areas. We believe these projects are necessary to Msssport, to the region, and to the communities. Without them, the Boston region will have serious traffic problems in the future. With them, the regionsl will be able to move ahead as it should and as it must.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Oavis.

I see enough new fsces to give agsin our theme. My name is Robert Tierney, and I am Commissioner of the Msssachusetts Department of Public Works. The resson we are here is to take testimony on the draft Environmental Impact Statement which contsins certain recommendations concerning increasing the capacity of Boston's Centrsl Artery and Third Harbor Crossing from Boston or South Boston to Esst Boston. We have a presrranged

schedule of speakers, which I have been following as much as possible. If there are gaos between the prearranged speakers, you are welcome to sign up to testify by going to the back of the room and leaving your name, and we'll call you as soon as we can. If you want to give testimony and you don't want to speak here today, you can put your testimony in writing to the Mass. Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston, Mass., and as long as we receive that by two weeks from today, August 22nd, your testimony will be as much a part of the record of this hearing as if you had spoken here.

Our next scheduled speaker is City Councillor Fred Langone. I don't believe he is here.

Since nobody else has signed up to speak, I am going to have about a three or four-minute recess, and we'll reconvene as soon as somebody is set to spesk.

Thank you.

(A short recess was then taken.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Could I have your attention, please? We are ready to reconvene the public meeting. Some of you who are standing around and tslking, will you sit down, and we'll get on with

it.

Our next scheduled speaker is here, City Councillor Fred Langone.

MR. LANGONE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly appreciate this opportunity to express the views of what I consider a large proportion of the people in my neighborhood who are concerned about the impact and effects of the depression of the Central Artery. We were afforded a half hour at this time. I didn't realize we had some of our people from the area coming in, and as I looked at the names, I can honestly say without fear of contradiction that what we're seeing here now is what the North End is saying.

For 20 years I have represented the city in the City Council. I have tried to do a good job, preserve the North End, try and protect all the interests down there. Despite it all, you always have a few who are friendly to the administration and who would come down and not represent the true sentiment of our area.

I could turn the clock back 31 years ago. I would see a different person at the table. His

name was Commissioner Callahan at the time. We had meetings here in this hall, God rest his soul. The people of the North End were concerned, but they were told a lot of things at that time. The arterial highway was good for them, it was going to keep traffic off their streets, put it up in the air. That way it won't bother you people, at that time they suggested 31 years ago.

The depression of the Central Artery, and I assume, I wasn't here at the beginning, but I assume we had a lot of professional businessmen, architects, engineers, labor leaders, everybody who thinks it's good for the North End to have this, it is good for the city, even though they might live in Winchester, Swampscott, East Overshoot, some place like that. It is always good for the North End to have more traffic. We had the tunnel, the Sumner Tunnel built in 1930. The Callahan Tunnel, the second tunnel, was going to be the panacea, the Rexall, the curer. Now we have the third tunnel, and the depression of the Central Artery.

Thirty years ago they called me an obstructionist. I lived long enough to have everybody say you are right. To be right is not

what I want to see. To do what is right is what I want to see, to do the right thing.

This is a project of great magnitude. We're going to spend between the Central Artery and the tunnel $2,400,000 at least at this point. It will probably run maybe to three billion by the time it's finished. The engineers on this project are the same engineers that were in the project 31 years ago, Fay, Spofford & Thorndike, and with due regard for their professionalism, they gave us a master plan. This is the master plan. This is the best plan. If it was such a good plan, then why didn't they go through with the master plan? The master plan called for the Leverett Circle connector to take the traffic off of Storrow Drive, off of the Expressway, over to 93 and over to 95 and the Mystic River Bridge, but if you see 31 years ago, they never built the Leverett Circle connector. You can still see the stumps of the arms on I-93. People are saying when they go by there why didn't that road go through? Where is that road going to? It never was built because obviously the master plan wasn't the master plan.

The inner belt in Roxbury was supposed to

take traffic away from the Central Artery. Was the inner belt built? The Maguire master highway plan? That wasn't built. But what is being built, and they say to me, and this is about my ninth meeting on this matter, they said to me the Expressway will fall down in ten years. That's how bad it is. The Mystic River Bridge is nine years older. It's still in good shape. Did different people, different contractors build the Mystic River Bridge? The same people, the same engineers. The Mystic River Bridge has been redecked since they built it, just little disruption.

The impact on the North End, I was around 31 years ago. There is some people in back here who were around 31 years ago. The impact was severe. It only took four and a half years to build the Central Artery. This is going to take 12 to 15 years to build the Central Artery. By their own admission on your EIS report, you say that the impact on business will be up to five percent loss of business. I wonder how many businesses can take a five percent loss, maybe even more. We had some meter maids and enforcing the parking laws several months ago in the North End. Merchants came into me and said we lost

30 percent business because traffic, because people couldn't come in there, all right, to pick up a bundle, three minutes in front of a store cost them $15.

You are going to lose 2,000 parking spaces between the North Station and State Street. Where are those cars going to park? At the North Station when the hockey game crowd comes and the basketball game and the Ice Capedes and the circus, where are they going to park?

Salvucci says we're going to take two floors of the Upham Center Garage, two floors. It is already jam packed now. He said, well, we have got the other garage at Clinton Street right outside these windows. It is already packed now. Where are these cars going? They're not just going to come here, and after 20 years devoting to rebuilding the North End and the waterfront we are asked, and somebody said that the North End will be better. Not now. It could be in 15 or 20 years, but who is going to survive 15 or 20 years? Who is going to survive this 15 or 20 years? They say, oh, we'll put parking, and, by the way, they said there won't be that many heavy equipment trucks, heavy equipment

bulldozers. We're going to do it different. We're going to put a slurry wall. How are you going to dig the slurry wall? From the bottom up? We're not going to take -- this is the big argument -- we're not going to take any property. You are going to build right up to the walls of the foundations of the existing buildings. You are going to maybe block off Salem Street a little. A little? A lot. And Hanover Street, you will be cutting down. Cross Street will be cut down to two lanes. That means the ones that park on the curb and the ones that travel. So two lanes of Cross Street are going to be taken. How is it going to handle the ramp, the tunnel ramp that comes out there and Hanover Street traffic together?

I hope you know what you are doing. I hope you are not just letting us beat our gums here, because I beat my gums 31 years ago and I didn't come here just for publicity because I am running for Mayor -- and by the way, I am glad the Mayor, Mayor White did a flip-flop. He waited until this morning. He did a flip-flop. I can remember March of 1982 I was in a church hall, and I can remember Governor Dukakis, Freddie Salvucci telling

those people over there last year, oh, there will be no Third Harbor Tunnel because it was election, and I hope that they remember those words. Thirty-one years ago, Dever was Governor. I talked to him about it, and we had a long conversation. I said, "Governor, this will hurt you."

"Oh," he said, "I won by a quarter of a million votes. I beat Governor Bradford by a quarter of a million votes. I could lose 50,000 votes."

The following year, Chris Herter beat him by 13,000 votes, so let no politician fail to care because all the newspapers and all the television and all the radio and all the big leaders who don't live down here are for it. I am not a crusader. If I see something is good, I will be behind it, but I don't think this is good. I think, Mr. Chairmen, that what you should consider, and I forgot to mention that right there at the Blackstone Street we have the pushcarts that have been there a hundred, 150 years. Who can tell me you're going to put a tunnel right under that street and you're not going to disrupt that market? Quincy Market, tell me you're not going to disrupt Quincy Market. Quincy

Market relies on the parking spaces underneath the Expressway. There are 2,000 parking spaces. Don't let it, the Boston Traffic Commission said there is 357 parking spaces. I don't know what time of the day they were counting. It must have been at four o'clock in the morning. There is 2,000 parking spaces under there. We have a parking plan now in the North End. We have God knows how many restaurants and places of business. Those places depend, your own EIS report says, those businesses depend on parking.

I have other speakers that are going to speak who will represent the people of this North End, but let me say this to you. I come here as a public official and a private resident of this neighborhood. I hope, and just one afternoon, last Saturday afternoon, we have over 4,000 signatures. We're going to present you later on with probably 30 to 40 thousand signatures, not only of people in Boston and in the North End, but people who shop in this area. This market and Quincy Market are the hub of the development in Boston. Anything that affects that will affect intown Boston, the entire development of downtown Boston as we know it. This

Expresswey will ceuse the disruption of business end the downward development of the intown downtown Boston as we know it. True it will create some jobs. Those jobs oo eway after. Those oeoole finish their work, and they go home. But we stay, and I'm not against economy, and I'm not ageinst employment, but by God, there are other weys of doing things.

There is rapid transit that could help. There is jobs building rapid transit. There is jobs redecking. There is jobs building the Leverett Circle connector. There is jobs with the inner belt and, oh, yes, the inner belt. Do you know why the inner belt wasn't built? Because it would destroy the trees on Memoriel Drive. Thet is why it was stopped. Whet ebout the people? Aren't they more important than trees? Do you know whet the pollution count is in front of Martinetti's according to your report? Fourteen. Nine is dangerous. I em wondering how we lived that long. I have lived there all my life. I em wondering why I em still alive. The pollution count in front of those two tunnels is abnormelly high. I have lived there. You are going to put, boy, you ere going to put some ventilating buildings. You are going to

put one right at the mouth of the two tunnels, a hundred-story ventilating building. It isn't bad enough now. You ere going to do thet.

So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I sincerely hope that you would heed our little cry here today. The North End and downtown Boston has suffered enough from the automobile. You have got to start thinking ebout peoole, people who live in the area, peoole who heve their -- I have got the fifth generetion in my family lives down in the North End. My little grandchildren are the fifth generatien of our family that has lived there. The State should show more consideration, not only et election time, but with a project like this.

I sincerely hope with all my heart thet you will, sir, take other steps to alleviate the traffic situetion in this area without depressing the Central Artery at this time, and I so recommend to you the construction of the Leverett Circle connector to alleviete the bottleneck at the North Station, the construction of the inner belt end the expansion of repid transit to the North and the Sout Shore.

Thank you very, very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You are going to have to identify yourself for the stenographer.

MR. MATARA: My name is Joseph Matara, President of Haymarket Pushcart Association. For the last eight years, I heve been e businessman in the North End, and e permanent status for 26 years. I have been working in the North End since I was e youth for the last 40 years. I heve made my living in this area here. I am also a former resident of the West End. I listened to oromises made by people from the State Deoartment before seying they were giving us amenities in the West End such as the pool, such as the perks and the playgrounds. They gave us those amenities and took them away from us by teking the rest of the West End away from us. There are no West Enders pleying in those pools and in those perks.

I made a living down here, and we heve struggled for it. In the lest few yeers we have seen a rejuvenation of business in the area, where from a marginal business, many people are doing rather well. With the idea of the depression of the Central Artery, which will teke by their words ten

years, and nobody has ever stayed to an estimate of time building or destructing something, we know it will be in excess of ten years that you will devastate the business community in the North End right now. You will devastate the restaurents thet have worked hard to make a business there and to employ people. You will devastate the Haymarket pushcart area with no source of recourse, none whatsoever. The lines that ere shown in your impec study use Cross Street and Blackstone Street as a divider for the construction area. Within that are is where these businesses orosoer. Those are the main arteries that feed the business area in the North End.

We heve spoken to many, many people, and heve attended many, meny meetings. This depression of the artery, I don't propose to be en engineer. We have looked and questioned them, the supposed engineers heve come down from the State. This hes never been done before anywhere in the world. Ther has never been such an excavetion and promising tha the artery will work while they excavate. They sel to us it was a Milan theory. Ageinst only a half-a support, there is no such thing es a Milen theory

with an excavation being completed underneath while there is a remaining structure overhead. This hasn't been done anywhere, and I don't think anywhere else in this country has a two billion dollar project been proposed and carried through yet. There is not one. This is the largest in magnitude.

As a man who has had to work for his money all his life and support his children, I respect that other people have to work. There are many construction jobs that would be entailed here. We also know by asking the people in the state that they put all their eggs in one basket with the depression of the artery. They have no other roads to circumvent the City of Boston and take traffic coming from the north over to Logan Airport, none whatsoever. There is no access road to go through Chelsea and Everett to East Boston. It would help Chelsea and Everett if there was a nice access road built there. We don't need this depression. This is like telling a man you have to bury him for ten years because his nose is too big. It just doesn't make sense. They will tell us anything we want, like a man courting a girl. When she acquiesces, she is left with the problem.

We cannot survive there. Businesses cannot survive for ten years for destruction and construction. The amenities to the North End will not do any good to the present residents who will be too old for anything, will not do any good for the present businessmen. As you can overlook this area here, all the large buildings are on this part of the artery. There are no high tower buildings in the other part. They have rezoned that area for general business. Evidently they're trying to really obliterate the North End. They're trying to take a viable working place, a viable living place away from the people that are there now.

This is the last of the strong ethnic neighborhoods, and it looks like it is trying to be devastated. We implore on reason and sanity this not be done. That other means be taken to take off the pressure of cars coming down the artery. We have other studies coming in that will be forthcoming before September 30th. In less than two hours on a very, very hot Saturday, we were able to produce almost 4,000 or better signatures on a petition requesting that the Central Artery be not depressed. Ten years of this we cannot live with. Many of us

won't be living, and we have no promise later on that our businesses will be here.

I appreciate the time and the exposure to say my part, and I represent businesses on both sides of the artery.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you.

MR. TECCI: My name is Albert Tecci, 53 Salem Street, North End. I represent a new group that has just been formed, and is mounting a drive. The name of the group is People Against Indiscriminate North End Destruction.

I would like to start off by quoting a report from the BRA in 1979: "If the Italian community does not work together and recognize the pressures on the North End and address them in a timely manner, there may be a limited future for the North End as an ethnic community."

Thus the formation of P.A.I.N.E.D. This report that I am about to read has been compiled after carefully studying the draft EIS, the supplemental draft EIS, attending public information meetings, and conducting our own independent

research.

The proposed depression of the Central Artery, while having the potential to alleviate some regional highway traffic, has a greater potential of incurring irrevocable harm, and the quality of life and the economic stability of the North End community. Although this report which we will have ready and published for everybody later on is not as extensive as the one prepared by the State agency, it accurately points out that all areas of the study; local business, traffic, noise level, vibrational impact, air quality, accident potential, and neighborhood environment will all be negatively affected by the proposed depression. This report which we will distribute is conclusive in that most of the information contained herein was gathered from published State and City studies regarding this proposed project.

The proposed plan to depress the alleviated Central Artery is one which involves seven stages: relocation of underground utilities, building of a slurry wall on both sides of the entire length of the project, removal of the old structural piles, building the tunnel from Dewey

Square to Causeway Street, removal of the elevated structure and then the development of the land. Both the draft EIS and the supplemental have a promulgation of benefits of the completed traffic. For example, highway may be lessened, and air quality rights on which the existing highway stands may be developed. However, neither study delves deeply into the impact on the North End community. Neither study is attentive to any possible solutions or alternatives for these negative impacts.

For example, in many cases the draft EIS supplement, sections covering impact on local street traffic does not even mention the North End. That's on Page 47.

In the same report, they concede on Page 111 that traffic accident potential in the streets will be increased on certain North End streets.

On Page 253 of the same study, it states local traffic will be heavier as a result of this completed project. In other words, even when it is completed, traffic in the North End is going to be heavier.

In addition, by their own calculations,

the graph on Page 12 of the summary shows the North End has a possible chance of maintaining its existing quality of life.

Furthermore, these studies show that business in the North End will also suffer. These negative conditions are all part of the long-term impact.

The period of construction ranges from anywhere from five to eight years on the surface, from ten to 15 years in completion. The total impact will very likely lead to the destruction of the last neighborhood in downtown Boston.

The traffic impact during the construction phase, during the three construction phases, relocating utilities, building slurry walls and excavating the old piles, as well as the last two phases, removing the overhead structure and developing the land, are estimated to a cover a period of three to eight years. A major portion of this construction will cover the area between Atlantic Ave. and Causeway Street, approximately half of the outside perimeter of the North End. Many streets, such as Hanover Street, Cross Street, North Washington, Endicott, Commercial, will be

overloaded with deterring traffic. This is all on Page 128 and 183 and 227 of the EIS report.

It also states that possibly up to a thousand or more trucks per week may be added to the already narrow, congested streets in and around this area. Again on Page 227 of this report.

The problem of safety for our elderly and young children will be crucial let alone what this congestion will do to our pollution and noise levels. In addition, increased traffic and construction will be a major obstacle in passing from the North End to the rest of the city. Walking at crosswalks and crossing will be dangerous. Again Page 183 of agency's report.

Parking, all parking facilities under the Central Artery will be lost due to construction, Page 193 and 194. According to the draft, alternative parking will be found. This is quite hard to believe, since no solutions to our existing parking problems in the North End have been found to date. How can the State say it will accommodate parking when we will have less space and more cars?

Believe it or not, one plan submitted by Mr. Vitagliano actually called for using our school

yards as parking facilities. Where, Mr. Vitagliano, should our children play?

The economy of the North End is based largely on local business. The major portion of this business comes from people out of the North End community, people that commute by car, people that might walk down. The bulk of these businesses are concentrated on Cross Street, Salem Street, Hanover Street, North Washington Street. These streets are the streets closest to this proposed project. Business will be severely affected by the overpowering combination of surface construction, the overbearing noise and dust that will accompany construction, increase traffic, dangerous constructional obstructions, the tremendous loss of parking facilities, and the overall inconvenience of reaching the North End.

A loss of business revenue of anywhere from 15 to 30 percent can be expected. In most cases, this will be detrimental and possibly fatal to local businessmen. There is no doubt that the quality of life of the North End is a strong, proud, Italian neighborhood and will be disruptad and posaibly destroyed during the 15 years of the

proposed project. It will be severely damaged economically through a loss of business, in addition to the hazardous, troublesome and nerve-racking inconvenience of the length of construction will more than likely force people to look for a more suitable place to live. Furthermore, during the construction phase the property value in this area will drop. Traditional ethnic events, such as the world famous I can say Feast of the North End and other celebrations will be greatly affected. Again even the draft EIS supplement gives the North End community only a 50 percent chance of survival -- a 50 percent chance of survival. I think they promised the West End a little more than that in the fifties, and we know what happened there.

I would like to take a look at the alternative that they call the no build alternative, which is rather an ultimatum rather than an alternative. The redecking of the existing structure will not by itself alleviate traffic congestion on the highway system. Yet better road conditions as a result of resurfacing, combined with an extensive campaign to utilize public transportation, can obtain these goals. In fact, $700 million has been

awarded to the State of Massachusetts just recently to improve its transit system. A public awareness campaign through the media can help initial problems faced with the delays caused by construction. Furthermore, not only will construction time be only three years, service disruption during the resurfacing will cut down on construction obstacles, noise levels, accident potential, increased traffic, and loss of parking will be at a minimum.

This alternative can be accomplished by use of a new method designed for tearing up the old highway surface. That method is one where they can saw large pieces of the surface and pick them up in one piece, transport them to some community on the South Shore for a possible sea wall. I am sure Hull and Scituate can appreciate that. This also, by not using jackhammers, will cut down on the dust, the noise, and the hazards to the below structure. The surface can now be kept intact. Parking can be kept intact under the artery if we resurface by putting up protection on the under surface of the steel beams by netting, by wood, or by metals. This method can cut down on construction time and almost

eliminate any adverse effect on the North End community. Facilities can remain utilized, and surface arteries may remain open to traffic. Resurfacing the existing artery with this new method may decrease construction time.

In any event, the resurfacing alternative will not have a major impact on residential disruption. It will not have more pedestrian hazards. It will not increase neighborhood street traffic. It will not lower property value, and it will not cause the loss of local businesses, and furthermore, it will not cause the loss of quality of life in the North End.

In determining whether the sacrifice of the entire community is justified for the sake of possibly alleviating regional highway traffic, the State has turned its back on the most integral part of society, namely the people. Interestingly enough, in the course of researching this project several enlightening facts were uncovered. Number one, in 1965, the time when the West End development was being finished, the area from Cross Street, North Washington, Salem, Cooper, Richmond, Fulton, Hanover have all been rezoned for retail and office

space. This comes from the BRA report on Page 72 of a 1982 Boston and Its Neighborhoods Study.

In 1979 the BRA published a book titled The North End and The Waterfront. In this book, it is made mention that while, quote, according to a map the North End appears to be in the heart of downtown, it is in fact semi-isolated, and, therefore, very different from the core of the city. It is our contention that the Central Artery is an asset in keeping the North End separate and distinct.

Yet in 1982, a book published again by the BRA titled Boston and Its Neighborhoods has no mention at all of the North End as a neighborhood of Boston. In fact, we are referred to as the central area.

This just adds to the show of neglect that the North End has received from city and state agencies. Another little factor that points out this neglect: there is a sign over the old Station One that is now called Police Station Area Coverage A. On that sign, it makes no mention of the North End as an area of coverage. It does have Beacon Hill, Charlestown, East Boston, and downtown. No mention

of the North End. At one time, Station One was the North End.

Are these cases of the, quote, out of sight, out of mind? Is this the mentality adopted by the city and state? Indeed the development of downtown Boston has accomplished much in enhancing this city. But long before development and long before traffic congestion, the North End has been a positive attraction in the cultural center of Boston, and so it shall remain.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, sir.

MR. LAMGONE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Our next scheduled speaker is Antonio Di Mambro. Is he here?

MR. DI MAMBRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairmen. My name is Anthony Di Mambro. I am a resident of the North End. I live on 161 Endicott Street.

I recognize the need and the importance of studying the roadway improvements included in the supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report entitled Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate 90/Central Artery, Interstate 93.

Overall, I believe the supplement EIS is a sensitive study that offers a range of preliminary solutions to the present and future problems related to the regional traffic and roadway system.

However, as a resident of the North End I am very concerned about the serious impact that the projects will have on my neighborhood. The EIS clearly outlines the impact in terms of dust, noise, traffic congestion, loss of parking spaces and accessibility. The EIS only hints at the long-range impacts and leaves undefined the future development of new parcels of land that will be created by the depression of the Central Artery. The mitigating measures are only loosely defined, and city and state commitments to enforce such measures are not properly articulated. Before the study proceeds I urge the authors of the EIS or its sponsors to further elaborate on these matters.

Although it is a neighborhood in flux, the North End still retains its character as a semi-isolated, cohesive, vibrant community, one that adds to the cultural diversity of Boston and embodies much of its history and richness. It is one of the nicest urban neighborhoods in America.

It is a pleasant place to live and it has a shopping/eating district that serves a large ethnic and non-ethnic population in the metropolitan area. What will happen to this unique urban environment if the Central Artery is depressed or restructured?

Although I believe that the neighborhood will continue its natural process of transformation, the artery improvements will accelerate this process. The North End is a neighborhood in transition. It has been such for quite some time and it will continue to be in transition independantly of the artery improvements. Changing real estate patterns, condominium conversions, poor parking and accessibility, gentrification and displacement, and increases in rent levels are already evident in the North End. The population is also changing. More and more professionals are moving into the neighborhood, 30 percent of the population is elderly. Forty-two percent are unemployed. Many of the old residents pay between 125 and $200 per month in rent for a one or two-bedroom apartment, while newcomers pay 400 to $600. About 45 percent of the real estate is controlled by absentee

landlords and much of the housing stock needs improvements and repairs. For how long can the North End community withstand the pressure to transform?

At this crucial point in the North End's history I see that the residents have basically two choices: opposition or constructive participation. Residents could oppose the depression of the artery and let the natural process of neighborhood transformation carry on. Or they could recognize that transformation is inevitable and use the issues and opportunities created by the artery improvements to unify the community and become primary factors in the definition of its future. I have opted for the second strategy because I believe in the long run it will be the most effective and successful one.

I strongly urge the state and the city to show with facts their commitments to facilitating the process of constructive participation of North End residents in the decision-making process before, during and after the implementation of the proposed artery improvements. It is crucial that this process be tailored to the specific needs and

characteristics of the North End population. I would like to offer the following suggestions as minimum requirements for a meaningful and effective process.

The state should institute and finance a North End residents' forum that will allow residents, businessmen, and neighborhood institutions to freely express their opinions, concerns and choices. It is in the context of this forum that residents must ask themselves and answer fundamental questions such as: What is the future of the North End? Does a cohesive ethnic community have a right to remain, live and prosper in the heart of Boston? Can the North End community as a whole benefit from the depression of the Central Artery? What are the restrictions that should be placed on the development of the parcels of land along the Central Artery, who is going to develop them, and who will benefit from their development? Residents need to be continuously informed about the various aspects of the project. At the same time they must have an opportunity to hear their own consultants or technical advisors in order to formulate their own positions. The state must pay

for the technical assistance that the residents will require throughout the process.

Before the proposed projects proceed, a detailed memorandum of understanding must be drafted and signed by the state, the City of Boston, and the North End community. This memo must contain all of the guarantees that the community will require to support the depression of the artery. It must precisely articulate all the mitigating measures necessary to cope with concrete issues such as noise parking shortage, traffic rerouting and congestion, lack of accessibility, loss of business, etcetera. Finally, the memo must indicate that the state and the city are strongly committed to conducting more in-depth studies of the long-term effects that the depression of the artery will have on the community. The state and the city must strongly commit themselves to developing and implementing the mechanisms that will mitigate and hopefully reverse the negative and disruptive trends that will undermine the quality of life in the North End. If the content of the memorandum is not honored by the parties involved then the community will undertake the necessary legal actions. The

state must commit itself to pay for all the legal expenses that may be necessary to defend the community.

The North End community must be the prime beneficiary for the future air-rights developments. These developments must be tightly controlled in terms of use, density, and urban design quality. This control must be exercised now and during the design phase. North End residents cannot wait until the Central Artery is depressed to know what will happen on these parcels of land. They have the right to affect and control the developments because they more than anyone else will put up with 15 years of disruption to their lives.

If the state and the city are ready to strongly commit themselves to the above points, then I am ready to give my cautious support to the proposed artery depression. I say cautious because even though I have a lot of trust in the current state administration, I know that administrations come and go. The North End is a living national treasure; it will be a disgrace for Boston, for Massachusetts, and for America if it will be dismantled or if it will be transformed into another

Society Hill or Beacon Hill without the consent of its residents.

The North End is an important part of our city's history and I sincerely hope that the process for its future transformation will be a model for other cities that face similar problems. The process requires a passionate and constructive involvement of the North End residents and the support of every citizen of Massachusetts, from Chinatown to Roxbury, from Gloucester to Provincetown, from Wellesley to Worcester. We need this support for the next 15 years.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Di Mambro. Do you have a transcript of that that you can leave with our stenotypist?

I would ask one favor. We have to change stenotypists. We have to change tapes.

MR. VISCOTI: I don't care if I am recorded. I want you to hear what I have to say. All right. First of all ---

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I would rather have you on the record. I really would.

MR. VISCOTI: First of all, wait a minute. I am from the North End. I don't know your name. Can you tell me who you are? Who are you?

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Wait.

MR. VISCOTI: I want to know who you are. Who are you? We're all talking at you. I don't even knew who you are. Who are you?

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: My name is Robert Tierney. I am Commissioner of the State Department of Public Works. If you want to go on the record or even talk to us ---

MR. VISCOTI: I'll wait right here.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You can wait, sir.

MR. VISCOTI: I don't want to go on the record. I just want to talk to you. I lived in the North End all my life.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Will you give me your name?

MR. VISCOTI: Nelson Viscoti.

I lived there all my life. I saw the community change left and right. I saw the people fight against condos. I saw the people fight against everything that came down the line. But one thing I didn't see happen that the Callahan Tunnel, when

you come into the North End, when you come into the North End from the Callahan Tunnel there should be an overpass there. Fifteen years there should have been an overpass there. It's a hazard. Not one thing has been done about it. No one has done anything.

You want to spend two and a quarter billion dollars on a project, and yet you have a cancer you haven't taken care of. Not even a bandaid have you put on the disaster we have here. If you want us to trust you, really I will be behind you a thousand percent. Prove yourself. Do something for the community. Put an overramp there.

I am really emotional, but this is sickening. Fifteen years we have said put a ramp so people can walk by.

So you shut me off? Sure, sure. That's the way it goes anyway.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Keep going.

MR. VISCOTI: You owe us. You owe us. You haven't done anything to prove yourself, and I am not going to stand up for it, and none of the people in the North End are going to stand up for it,

It's a disgrace you come in here and get your paychecks, and us go home and fight amongst ourselves.

That's how I feel. Whether you are happy or not, I could care less.

COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: There will be a five-minute intermission.

(A short recess was then taken.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Judith McGovern Williams, do hereby certify that the foregoing record, Pages 1 through 134, is a true and accurate record of the testimony taken on August 8, 1983 to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Judith McGovern Williams
Registered Professional Reporter

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS SENATE
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON 02133
ROOM [illegible] TEL. 722-1500

[illegible] FOR GEORGE BACHRACH
[illegible] AND SUFFOLK DISTRICT

COMMITTEES
Counties (Chairman)
Taxation (Vice Chairman)
Criminal Justice
Vice Chairman)

August 8, 1983

[illegible]mony of Massachusetts State Senator George Bachrach in favor of widening and [illegible]ssing the Central Artery in Boston

I have come to testify at this hearing today to voice my support for the widening [illegible] depressing of the Central Artery in Boston. As the State Senator representing the [illegible]on-Brighton area of Boston and the nearby communities of Cambridge, Watertown, and [illegible]nac, I am acutely aware of the impact that continued and increased traffic congestion [illegible]n Central Artery has, not only on Boston, but on the entire Metropolitan and New [illegible]nd region as well. The plan which I support then, is the one which affords the most [illegible]roved access into and through the city by reducing congestion on the single most [illegible]rtant stretch of roadway in the Commonwealth.

[illegible]To simply rehabilitate the existing Central Artery would be to ignore a number of [illegible]rous negative impacts, far more significant than the gain from the maintenance which [illegible]d be performed on the present structure. During the construction period, a number of [illegible]ffic lanes would have to be closed down and would add to the present problems for a [illegible]ber of years. Once the construction were completed, the roadway would not provide any [illegible]crease in capacity nor alleviate any of the congestion problems. In fact, the volume of [illegible]ffic will likely have increased, while the artery's effectiveness will have decreased. [illegible]r spending millions of dollars for repairs, the result would be a net loss in the [illegible]bility to move traffic and to meet increased demands for access through this area.

In contrast to rehabilitation, all plans to depress and widen the Central Artery [illegible]vide for improved access and lower congestion. Depressing the roadway would reduce [illegible]se levels by up to ten decibels, while widening the roadway would reduce by up to 7%, [illegible]pollution produced by stagnant traffic. Another advantage to the depress and widen

(2)

plans is that the entire existing Central Artery would remain in service and intact until construction of the new roadway were completed, minimizing disruption during the transition period.

Once construction were completed, the big, green Central Artery erector set, which has separated Boston from its historic waterfront for so many years, could be removed. Isolated parts of the city would be reunited to the city proper, and the quality of life would be improved greatly in these neighboring areas. The aesthetic appeal of the entire area would be enhanced with the removal of this tremendous "eyesore", while local roads on both sides could be reconnected to provide corridors of improved pedestrian access to the city and the ability to walk to the sea from the downtown area uninterrupted. And for the first time in years, natural light would shine on the areas beneath the present Central Artery.

Beyond the positive local effects of a depressed artery is the impact on the local regional economy of the Greater Boston area. Businesses throughout the region depend heavily on their ability to reach Logan Airport and the port of Boston, as well as areas north, west, and south of the city. The High Technology industry, an important part of the state's economy, has traditionally grown in areas which can provide access to markets reached by sea and air. The impact of improved access through the Central Artery will provide the kind of access High Tech needs to continue to function in this state.

Similarly, light industry, the prevalent form of industry in my own district, depends heavily on the ability to reach markets serviced by the Central Artery. The ability of light industry to produce, depends on its ability to move goods into and out of the area. Reduced congestion on the Central Artery can only be an asset for light industry and the local economy.

Removal of the existing structure would provide economic benefits to the immediate [illegible]ntown area as well. Approximately twenty acres of new, developable land would become available on the air rights over a depressed artery. Projected development would generate as many as 9400 new jobs and increase annual retail sales in the area by nine or ten million dollars.

(3)

When all these factors are considered, the cost of building a widened and depressed [illegible]ral Artery is dwarfed by the gains and savings the project would generate in other [illegible]. The economic benefits for the entire region, the aesthetic improvements in the [illegible]diate area, the reduction of air and noise pollution on the environment, the [illegible]nection of the city of Boston to its neighborhoods, its waterfront, and its historic [illegible] are all beneficial and desirable returns from the investment in an improved Central [illegible]ty. Widening and depressing would produce more positive results than any modernizing [illegible]habilitating plan ever could. I urge you therefore to report favorably on the [illegible]n which would improve access to and through the Central Artery.

I thank you for your consideration in this matter.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS SENATE
STATE HOUSE, BOSTON 02133
ROOM 405 TEL. 722-1200

SENATOR GEORGE BACHRACH
MIDDLESEX AND SUFFOLK DISTRICT

COMMITTEES
COUNTIES (CHAIRMAN)
TAXATION (VICE CHAIRMAN)
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
VICE CHAIRMAN

August 3, 1983

Testimony of Massachusetts State Senator George Bachrach in favor of widening and depressing the Central Artery in Boston

I have come to testify at this hearing today to voice my support for the widening and depressing of the Central Artery in Boston. As the State Senator representing the Allston-Brighton area of Boston and the nearby communities of Cambridge, Watertown, and Belmont, I am acutely aware of the impact that continued and increased traffic congestion on the Central Artery has, not only on Boston, but on the entire Metropolitan and New England region as well. The plan which I support them, is the one which affords the most improved access into and through the city by reducing congestion on the single most important stretch of roadway in the Commonwealth.

To simply rehabilitate the existing Central Artery would be to ignore a number of serious negative impacts, far more significant than the gain from the maintenance which must be performed on the present structure. During the construction period, a number of traffic lanes would have to be closed down and would add to the present problems for a number of years. Once the construction were completed, the roadway would not provide any increase in capacity nor alleviate any of the congestion problems. In fact, the volume of traffic will likely have increased, while the artery's effectiveness will have decreased. After spending millions of dollars for repairs, the result would be a net loss in the ability to move traffic and to meet increased demands for access through this area.

In contrast to rehabilitation, all plans to depress and widen the Central Artery provide for improved access and lower congestion. Depressing the roadway would reduce noise levels by up to ten decibels, while widening the roadway would reduce by 40 to 7%, air pollution produced by stagnant traffic. Another advantage to the depress and widen

plans is that the entire existing Central Artery would remain in service and intact until construction of the new roadway were completed, minimizing disruption during the transition period.

Once construction were completed, the big, green Central Artery structure set, which has separated Boston from its historic waterfront for so many years, could be removed. Isolated parts of the city would be reunited to the city proper, and the quality of life would be improved greatly in these neighboring areas. The aesthetic appeal of the entire area would be enhanced with the removal of this tremendous "eyesore", while local roads on both sides could be reconnected to provide corridors of improved pedestrian access to the city and the ability to walk to the sea from the downtown area uninterrupted. And for the first time in years, natural light would shine on the areas beneath the present Central Artery.

Beyond the positive local effects of a depressed artery is the impact on the local regional economy of the Greater Boston area. Businesses throughout the region depend heavily on their ability to reach Logan Airport and the port of Boston, as well as all north, west, and south of the city. The High Technology industry, an important part of the state's economy, has traditionally grown in areas which can provide access to major reached by sea and air. The impact of improved access through the Central Artery will provide the kind of access High Tech needs to continue to function in this state.

Similarly, light industry, the prevalent form of industry in my own district, depends heavily on the ability to reach markets serviced by the Central Artery. The ability of light industry to produce, depends on its ability to move goods into and out of the area. Reduced congestion on the Central Artery can only be an asset for light industry and the local economy.

Removal of the existing structure would provide economic benefits to the immediate Watertown area as well. Approximately twenty acres of new, developable land would become available on the air rights over a depressed artery. Projected development would generate as many as 9400 new jobs and increase annual retail sales in the area by nine or ten million dollars.

When all these factors are considered, the cost of building a widened and depressed Central Artery is dwarfed by the gains and savings the project would generate in other ways. The economic benefits for the entire region, the aesthetic improvements in the immediate area, the reduction of air and noise pollution on the environment, the reconnection of the city of Boston to its neighborhoods, its waterfront, and its historic past, are all beneficial and desirable returns from the investment in an improved Central Artery. Widening and depressing would produce more positive results than any modernizing or rehabilitating plan ever could. I urge you therefore to report favorably on the plans which would improve access to and through the Central Artery.

I thank you for your consideration in this matter.

VOLUME: II
PAGES: 1 - 46
EXHIBITS: 0

PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1983

3 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.

FANEUIL HALL

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Corridor Public Hearing for Central Artery
Interstate Route 93 and Third Harbor Tunnel,
Interstate Route 90 in Boston, Massachusetts

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Robert T. Tierney, Commissioner
Matthew Coogan, Undersecretary of Transportation
J. William Oliver, Project Manager

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

I N D E X

Proceedings Page 2-3

MR. COOGAN: We are now reopening the public hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Statement project and the supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement project for the Third Harbor Tunnel, Central Artery. My name is Matthew Coogan. I'm Undersecretary of Transportation. I will be chairman for the rest of the afternoon. We are honored this afternoon to have the president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Mr. James Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, my name is James Sullivan, and I'm the president of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, and as you are aware, the impact of the proposed construction of a Third Harbor Tunnel and the decompression of the Central Artery as something that is of great concern to the Greater Boston community. I might indicate that the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce has about 2,000 members, and we are very concerned with the impact of this construction as it applies to Greater Boston. As a result of that, we had a meeting -- my chairman, Jim McDonald, and myself back about two or three weeks ago and we both indicated to him what we proposed to do, and I would like to quote from that particular letter to the Governor.

"In March of this year the Board of Directors of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement on the Third Harbor Tunnel and were impressed with the quality and thoroughness of the analysis. As a result, the Board of Directors took a position in favor of the construction of the Third Harbor Tunnel to relieve traffic congestion which, if not addressed, would become intolerable by the year 2010. The Third Harbor Tunnel would also provide needed vehicular access to Logan International Airport which is necessary to serve the economic interests of our region.

After the completion of the E.I.S. any action by the Chamber's Board, Secretary of Transportation Frederick Salvucci, commissioned a supplement E.I.S. which would look at additional alternatives to those already studied and added a component to do an E.I.S. on the depression of the Central Artery. Recognizing the dimensions of the problems to be faced, the commissioning of the additional studies would seem to be a prudent course of action for any and all potential solutions should be investigated. It is probably unlikely that any single solution will be entirely satisfactory. The depression of the Central Artery has

been a proposal that has been in existence for at least eight years and deserves serious consideration.

The time frame for the completion of the E.I.S. supplement is extremely tight requiring a decision to be made by September 30, 1983. The Secretary of Transportation recognizee this and has already asked the Federal Government for a 90-day extension to allow completion.

It is clearly evident that even after completion of the supplementary E.I.S. that to properly evaluate the alternatives and their relationships not only to the environment, but to traffic, economic development, land use planning, economic considerations, construction feaeibility, construction timetables, soil and foundation conditions, disruption of business and project phasing will require a comprehenaive analysis of both the original E.I.S. and the supplementary by experts in these fields. Then and only then can the Greater Boston community arrive at a concensus on the proper approach to the problems.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce believes that the projects and the problems are of such magnitude that a task force of business leaders should be appointed to monitor and evaluate the proposals from

all aspects. This task force on the Third Harbor Tunnel/ depressed Central Artery will be assisted by a Technical Advisory Committee representing all disciplines who will advise the members by monitoring the ongoing studies.

At the present time a volunteer Technical Advisory Committee has been established under the chairmanship of Cy Mintz -- an architect and city planner who was the former Director of Planning and Design for the downtown Waterfront and Faneuil Hall for the Chamber. Also agreeing to serve are Stephen Varga -- a principal in the engineering firm of Weidlinger Associates, an international firm specializing in structural engineering; Don Goldberg -- a principal in the firm of Goldberg-Zoino Associates, Geotechnical Engineers, Soils Engineers and Foundation Consultants; Philip Bonanno, a construction engineer with the J. F. White Construction Company; and Kevin Lynch, a former professor of planning at M.I.T. and a city planner. Other disciplines will be added during the courses of the analysis as needed.

It is my belief that only through such a comprehensive approach can the Greater Boston business community assure that the alternatives are properly

weighed to guarantee the right decision or decisions."

Mr. Chairman, since that time we have appointed a Task Force and the Technical Advisory Committee, and for the record I will introduce the members of the Technical Advisory Committee: Phil Bonanno, president and general manager of J. F. White Contracting Company; James Brown, Director of Joint Center for Urban Studies; Donald Goldberg, principal, Goldberg-Zoino & Associates, Inc.; John Priestly, architect/developer of Ruseian Wharf; Bruce Campbell, New England Regional Manager of T.A.M.S., Inc. who also was the Commissioner of Public Works assigned the Commission Administration: Harold Fodden, who was a vice president of Little Company: Kevin Lynch, who waa the principal and profsssor or former profeseor at M.I.T.; William Rizzo, principal of Rizzo Associates; Stephen Varga, principal in Weidlinger & Associates; and Samuel Mintz, principal of Mintz Associates Architects/Planners, Inc.

This Technical Advisory Committee is reviewing and analyzing the E.I.S. which is, as you are aware, approximately five to six million documents containing about 600 pages. They also are analyzing it from the area of impact on their area of specialties and they are

working with a Task Force with business leaders in the Greater Boston community. And I would like to identify them for the record now.

The Chairman of the Task Force is Harold Hestnes who is a partner of Hale & Dorr: Kenneth Rossano, Chairman, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce and also is a senior vice president of the Bank of Boston; myself as president, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce: John J. Bacon, president of the Boston Gas Company; Norm Leventhal, Chairman of The Beacon Companies; Richard J. Lundgren, president of the Greater Boeton Real Estate Board: Andrew Macalaster, president of Merchco Investment Corporation; Roderick MacDougall, Chairman of the Bank of New England; Daniel Mahoney, president of the Massachusetts Bar Aseociation; Joseph Mullaney, senior vice president of the Gillette Company; Albert E. Mullin, Jr., who is a vice president of corporate relations for the Digital Equipment Corporation: Elliot Stone who is the president of the Jordan Marsh Company; John Larkin Thompson, president of Blue Shield of Massachusetts: Robert E. Page, president of the Boston Herald: John Ryan, president of Ryan, Elliott & Co., Inc.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has been working

and it is our understanding that written communication on the E.I.S. will be received by the secretary in that department until approximately 11:59 on August the 22nd. It is our hope to have a detailed analysis that will be agreed upon by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Task Force that will then go to the Chamber of Commerce and we will be prepared to meet on Auguat the 17th to establish a position by the Board of Directors. And we will then, aa soon as that is accomplished, submit our report to the Secretary and Governor. The fact is that these projects are interrelated and the project and the development of E.I.S. seems to me that from my review they are very needed. They combine a lot of implications for the future of Greater Boston, not only in transportation, but in other areas of discipline and concern. And we want to make sure that we are together on the iasus of making sure that whatever results will benefit the economic viability of Greater Boston as well as transportation problems. Thank you.

MR. COOGAN: Mr. Sullivan, if I could be allowed a personal comment, the array of business leaders and technical leaders in the Chamber as assembled is massively impressive. But just let me comment that the work the Chamber of Commerce is doing

is very much appreciated and the caliber of people brought together is down right impressive.

MR. SULLIVAN: Let me assure the Chairman and Secretary that we want to make sure that the decisions are made on the basis of an objective analysis of the E.I.S. and its impacts. And I'm sure that both the Secretary and the Governor and the business community have a common purpose, and that's to ensure that not only is transportation and traffic access improved substantially becauee certainly it couldn't get much worse, although some predictions do, we do what we do based upon the facts of the E.I.S. rather than some subjective analysis of the report. On this basis I can assure you that these technical experts came to this with an open mind. They are very skilled in different areas and the Taak Force itself is created of a cross-section of the business community who hopefully will look at this subjective analysis as well.

MR. COOGAN: We appreciate your work and look forward to your input.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are now in the phase of the public hearing where we are operating on a first come, first serve basis. For all those who would like to speak, kindly go to the desk immediately on your left

as you arrive. Then we'll get everybody's name on a first come, first serve basis. Let me further make the statement that consistent with what Mr. Sullivan has said, that we will be accepting comments about the Environmental Impact Statement until August 22nd. Any comments we receive by August 22nd have the same legal validity as testimony made here today. We must respond to them and incorporate them in the final dreft. You should address any such comments to the Department of Public Works, 100 Nashue Street, Boston, Massachuaetts. Next on the list of people who have asked to speak is Mr. Michael Deluty if I pronounced it right.

MR. DELUTY: That's it.

MR. COOGAN: Would you kindly stete your name?

MR. DELUTY: My name is Michael Deluty, and I have a small building in the area of the Weterfront and the Expresswey. I'm also a local businessmen and also an engineer by profession. I'm here mainly to ask questions for the record rather than make comments. Until last week I was very much in favor of it becauae the value of my property is greatly harmed by the Expreasway right next to it. After the meeting -- the Waterfront meeting last Wednesdey, I found there were questions that have not been answered in any sense of

the word, and they frighten the hell out of me. I'd love to see that thing go, love it, but at what price? And the first question is at what price? I was told a lot of educators have done a lot of studies and they said they'll maintain the Waterfront. The Waterfront as we all know is very old and it is on wood piles. And if the water tables dropped very much, it would be an unmitigated disaster. And the question was not answered as to how the water tables can be maintained during construction. They said that there will be test wells monitoring the level and there will be holes in the slurry wall. Now being an engineer, I know that a lot of formulas in the laboratory go right out the window when you go in the field. When they built the Marriott Hotel, I don't know if any studies were done, but it is all one building and the water can slosh all around. From my own observation, and I've been in the area 16 years, the water tables drop between six and twelve inches just from the Marriott Hotel. It is also an eatablished fact that the water taole will drop further from the Center Building, and these aren't barriers. These are just tubs in the ground. And they can monitor the thing, but what happens if it starts dropping? Do they just waah it? How are they going to

solve it? How are they going to prevent any damage to the buildings in that area? That's one question.

The other question I have is vibration problems during the construction ae I was told last Wednesday on the concrete type roadway under the lanea of the Expressway near the Waterfront. In the North End people think they are going to be worried from the noise of the trucks and dirt. I think everybody hes got a leason coming as to what may happen from vibration from these trucks rumbling along back and forth. What studies have been done? How can anybody know about the vibrations? At one time at the intersection of State Street and the Expresswey there waa a hole in the ground for utility work. And there were steel platea over thia hole. When the trucks ran over the steel pletes, you could not stand within three feet of the area. It waa impoaaible. It waa painful. I know that the roadway would be more sturdy than that, but, you know, what's going to happen?

The other thing I esk is how much of the traffic on the Expreasway is through traffic? And someone said, "Well, we don't know. When thia atudy waa done, it was 40, 50 percent." Now, I have done no studiea. But I've been in and out of town for 16 yeara,

and I sit there in my window and watch the Expressway. And I would say 70 to 80 percent is through traffic. Very little of the relative traffic gets off the Haymarket/Dock Square/State Street/High Street areas -- very little. So I say what is wrong with building through the Harbor Tunnel building another tunnel following the coastline in Boston as an expressway, a throughway around the coastline from South Station around the North End and up to Mystic Bridge or wherever you tie in as a throughway, no exits. Build the tunnel, build the second tunnel, and then see what's left on the Expressway. And I'll bet you a cup of coffee that you'll have so little left and you'll get rid of the Central Artery altogether. And one example I make is before new Atlantic Avenue waa put in, when the old Atlantic Avenue waa there, that waa a subatitute Expreasway, because when the Expreaaway got clogged up, everyone came off the ramp, ran up Atlantic Avenue and tied it up farther north. One of the purposea to stop thet waa to put in new Atlantic Avenue, narrow it down, make it full of red lighta and cut it out. And lo and behold it waa cut out, okay?

The other queation I have is if you are building an eight-lane road, I'll bet you another cup

of coffee everyone will wish it was a ten-lane road, okay? And all these projections are for the year 2010, and you can't make projections for the year 1988. So I'm saying that yes, get $2 million to the Commonwealth, get the jobs, get it all, but do the tunnel. And then attack what's left of the problem for the Expressway.

And the final comment is that I don't know, but I've heard in testimony a little while ago that no project of this type has ever been tried in the entire world. Whether or not that's true, I don't know. But I'll bet you that with a red line tunnel and the blue line tunnel and all the other problems here now, there is going to be a lot of problems nobody has ever encountered. And the problem with that is that once you encounter them and this kind of environment with the ocean and the clay and the sand and the 200-year old buildings, you might have a disaster. And that might be a disaster that will turn into 25 years to solve and totally dissipate the entire area. So yes, I want to see that thing go. I think the tunnel is the alternative to look at. But even so, I really think there should be some very heavy answers on water table problems if you go underground. Thank you.

MR. COGAN: Thank you, Mr. Deluty. Your questions concerning water tables and vibrations and others you have raised, we legally must give you some response. Please understand that response will represent the state of the art at that moment, if any of those questions can be answered, in the design phase and appropriate engineering.

MR. DELUTY: May I ask at that phase, at the design phase, is this like a fast scrap project? In other words, you are committed and you are solving it. Do you need the whole or is there a possibility that in the design phase, if you find problems that are really not solvable, is the project going to be changed, stopped

MR. COGAN: It certainly could be politically. The point is that you have the right to bring those questions here and they will be immediately addressed.

MR. DELUTY: Thank you.

MR. COGAN: We are in the phase of this public hearing where we are taking testimony from anyone. You do not need to have formally requested time. You do not need any step at all except to sign up. I do not see that anyone has signed up again. Does anyone wish to testify? What we are doing here is 12 hours of testimony today. We'll be open for 12 hours

of testimony tomorrow. We're trying to be as flexible as we can for people with difficult hours. Are there any comments at this point? Why don't we recess until four o'clock because it is a nice round number, and then we'll reopen the hearing at that point. Hearing no objections, we will be recessed until four o'clock.

[Recess until 4:00 p.m.]

[Reeume proceedings at 4:00 p.m.]

MR. COGAN: If you want to present testimony relative to this hearing, the hearing will be opened at any time. If there is anybody who wishes to present testimony, kindly go to the desk which is on the left as you come in the door. The hearing will remain in recess until somebody wants to testify. And we'll start right up then. So we'll be gone for another ten minutes. The hearing is in recess.

Ladies and gentlemen, those of you who have just come in here, we are having a two-day meeting, a public hearing, to accept any and all comments about the statements to a depressed Central Artery. If anyone wishes to give testimony, you can simply go up to the desk there, write down your name and start up the hearing. We've been going now for eight hours or something. We're enthusiastic about hearing from you,

so please step right up and we'll start the hearing whenever you are ready.

[Recess proceedings.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is currently 4:30. Let me make my speech again. We are committed to staying here for 12 hours today, from 11 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night. We want to receive public input from whoever has anything to say. All you have to do is go up to the desk and write down your name and we'll start up. A lot of people will be getting out of work between now and five o'clock. We do have four or five people who want to speak at five o'clock, so we'll start as soon as anybody has any comments to make. See you then.

[Recess proceedings.]

Ladies and gentlemen, we'll reconvene the hearing at five o'clock. That seems to be the simplest way of doing things. We'll reconvene at five o'clock.

[Recess proceedings.]

Ladies and gentlemen, for your information, we'll be starting up the hearing again at five o'clock, so whatever you want to do between now and then, five o'clock we'll be starting back up again.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now exactly five

o'clock. We're going to begin the evening session. We'll be going from approximately five o'clock right on to 11 o'clock tonight. Let me introduce myself. My name is Matthew Coogan. I'm Undersecretary of Transportation. We will be calling experts who have asked to testify. Anyone who wishes to testify simply has to go up to the desk and sign your name and we will take people on a first come, first serve basis. We have three people who have asked to speak at five. This is a critical time for the project. This is the time when all public comments are asked on the adequacy of the draft document. By law we must respond. We must accept your comments, respond to them in the final Environmental Impact Statement report, and your comments will be included in the draft statement. For any of those who wish to testify, we accept written comments. Comments should be addressed to the Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston. Now it is five. We have three experts who have asked to speak at five. The first is Oscar DeStefano.

MR. DeSTEFANO: Good evening. My name is Oscar DeStefano, and I represent the local businesses in the area, also real estate in the area. I am dependent upon foot traffic as much as other patrons. No doubt

that the basis for this artery is the amount of money being supplemented by the Federal Government. Whatever these amounts may be are going to be honored by the new administration. If I may reiterate, the North End no longer will exist the way in which it does. We feel that local separateness will no longer be there. It took years for the people to get used to it and fall in love with it and we created the best place and the safest to live in. I am personally speaking of the time element from 10 or 15 years. There is a substantial loss of business and one compensation that has been made, that even though I am not at the beginning of the construction site -- however, there have been provisions for the Quincy Market crowd which keep me going -- I'm speaking about crossover ramps. I haven't seen any. That's what I am built on. I would also like to see a substantial decrease in the noise level. The level will increase by up to 10 decibels. Hearing is a loss forever in life. I have residents to worry about and also a possible loss of real estate. The North End has been in stages. How will this affect citizens? I really don't know at this point. However, I have lost substantial amounts of business -- just by the last Friday that the lights went out and the lights were off

at 5:30 to 9:30. It was a Friday night and it was a feast night.

MR. COOGAN: Could I ask what business it is?

MR. DELUTY: The Cafe Paradiso on Hanover Street. And from 5 to 9:30, that's when other members in the area didn't do any business, between 5:30 and 10:30. There has been provisions for loss of utilities. I'd like to see them because once is enough. I've also had that same experience at other times and every time I lost business. There are other critical situations which at the time they don't come to mind, but I wrote them down for you. And I will read them to you. I'd like to state that for the betterment of society I hope that sometime today or for the future it puts a regression back into time. This is one time when it doesn't regress the whole pattern and growth in the North End. Over the years there was formed an isolation, not in the negative sense. It formed an isolation in the positive sense. I've been in the neighborhood for 22 years. I built my business. And there has been a few years that I took over for my parents. However, over the next 10 years if I see a downfall into it, I'll be 40. I don't know what I'm going to do then. Thank you.

MR. COOGAN: Thank you for your testimony. We'll have responses to each of your questions printed within the text of the final statement and there are members of the staff around here who can help you with any specific questions you might have if you want to ask them further.

This is going into the format. Again, your timing was exactly perfect. We are asking everyone to stay within eight minutes. The next person who has requested to speak is Mr. Theodore Barr.

MR. BARR: My name is Theodore Barr, and I'm a resident of the North End, and I live on Hanover Street currently. I represent seven local businesses. You don't know the impact, I do. To address just the issue of parking, I have been given three sets of answers. On parking the question is -- you yourself say -- I quote from your own document, "Identification of appropriate staging for construction." That's 1500 pieces of driftwood and 4,000 employees. One person is hoping they were going to put them under the Expressway and you say there are 305 second parking spaces under the Expressway. This seems to contradict itself. The greater worry, though, is the railroad. No plans seem to have been made for reasonable

compensation. The thought that someone would offer $500 helping a business which is dependent upon its economic neighborhood ie absurd. It cost $2,000 to hire a marketing consultant in the best of times, and not go over $10,000 for real property -- what year was this study done in? Finally for some rsason ths North End seems like a good place to run this past, as does East Boston, as does etcetera. Several years ago this proposal was brought into us through the suburbs. They didn't want it. Whatever makes the State Oepartment of Utility think that the innercity wants it anymore than the suburbs? This is absurd. Finally, the last five years I have been working in and around downtown. And my recent job was spending a year in Chinatown. And a lot of promises were made thsre as well. It is very hard to find Boston Chinatown. Compared to 10 yeare ago, precisely the same promises were made by a different organization. That's all I have to say.

MR. COOGAN: Thank you, Mr. Barr. The third person who has requested to speak is Ellsa Gomez.

MS. GOMEZ: Yes. Hello. I'm Elisa Gomez. I'm a resident and a retailer in the North End. I'm not one of the long-time residents that's been speaking.

I moved to Boston five years ago from Florida. I chose the North End because it was safe. It was a livable neighborhood. Now it seems that it is the last one. I don't see Beacon Hill or Back Bay as alternatives. It is the only one that I can afford. What would they like to see us do, move to the suburbs so we can commute in along with everyone else? This housing market in Boston is impossible enough without moving from the last neighborhood. In addition, as a retailer, I depend upon the tourist trade as do so much of us around this neighborhood. The Freedom Trail runs right in front of my store. It also runs by the Old North Church, Paul Revere's house, several historical sites. What will become of the Freedom Trail? The plan I think is an atrocity. Ths only ones who will gain from it, from the plan are the suburban commuters. And it -- again, it will be at the expenss of those of us who live and work in the city.

MR. COOGAN: We're not using this in the question and answer format -- but the question of the Freedom Trail -- there is a policy commitment that all the major pedestrian paths crossing the Artery today will be kept in operation and from construction. Most certainly the Freedom Trail.

The next person who has requested the opportunity to give testimony is Bill Steffens.

MR. STEFFENS: My name is Bill Steffens, and I'm ths transportation project manager at the Old Colony Planning Council in Brockton. And I'm here today to speak on behalf of ths Old Colony Joint Transportation Committee which is a Citizens' Advisory Committee. I have a letter of tsstimony that I'd like to read into the minutes, and then I'll submit a written testimony. It is addressed to Robert McDonagh.

"Oear Mr. McDonagh: On behalf of the Old Colony Joint Trensportation Committee, I would like to offer the following comments on the Third Harbor Tunnel/Cantral Artery Oraft Environmentel Impect Statement. The region we repreeent extends from the Town of Plymouth on the east to the Brockton urbanized area on the west; a population of 270,000 persons.

The region has a traffic problem. Nearly one-half of the region's labor force commutes outside of the region each day to work. The Central Artery is the only means for the auto-driving work force to reach work placss in the Boston centrsl business district and points north of Boston. The current delays cost the residents of this region time and money on a daily basis.

This project will relieve existing cost impositions and reduce future cost.

From an economic development standpoint, a third harbor tunnsl is critical to the region. In the past 20 years, areae to the south of Boston have not enjoyed the same levels of success in attracting high technology firms as have communities to the north and west of Boston. The reason is clear. High tech firms rely on air freight services to ship the majority of their goods. Airport access is therefore a crucial determinant in locating new facilities. Because airport access is poor from the south, economic dsvelopment has been restrained throughout the region to the south of Boston.

The Old Colony Joint Transportation Committee has endorsed the concept of a combined depressed Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project since its inception for thees reesons. Further, the committee's concensus is that to effectively address the congestion problems which exist now and will worsen in the future, the depressed Central Artery cannot be separated from the Third Harbor Tunnel project. Both must be completed and in staging ths project, the Third Harbor Tunnel section should be built first. This would immediately

begin to improve the commute to and from the Boston CBD and points north and minimize congestion throughout the construction period.

Finally, we are confident that the Massachusetts Department of Public Works will satisfactorily mitigate the adverse impacts of the construction phase. In light of this and the above-mentioned benefits, we lend our full support and endorsement to the supplemental draft E.I.S. and the alternatives which combine the depressed Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel project. We urge the agencies and personnel involved to expedite the project to the greatest extent possible, not only to meet federally-mandated deadlines, but to ensure the continued economic development of the Old Colony Planning Council region and the South Shore."

MR. COOGAN: Thank you, Mr. Steffens. The next speaker is Mr. Nicholae Contos.

MR. CONTOS: My name is Nicholae Contos, and I've been happy to be in South Boston for 30 years. I own a business there and I own a piece of property there. I'm against the Third Tunnel for the various reasons that I'm going to state here in a minute. I think the Third Tunnel will divide the City of Boston

with South Boston in half. It is going to create an iron curtain. Right now the City of Boston is expanding and every other city in the United States admires it. This project will depress the Artery and in building a tunnel will destroy all the momentum that the City of Boston has acquired in the last few years. They tell us it is not going to disturb business. I believe when they built the Turnpike Extension and the Artery -- I remember it hurt the City of Boston quite a bit. It hurt all the merchants. And I would like to see why they are going to tell us it is not going to hurt the merchants. It is going to make South Boston and East Boston a parking lot. Half of East Boston is a parking lot already. It will create more air pollution, create air noise and create more traffic. I think there is another alternative to all these things. We have the water. We have the Boston Harbor. Why don't you use a ferry to go back and forth to Boston with no money, very little money spent here? It won't create air pollution. It doesn't create noise. It can bring the people for the merchants and you will stop spending billions of dollars which will deprive the rest of the state of all the spending. Over a five, six-mile area, I wonder what's going to happen to

the rest of the state? Thank you.

MR. COOGAN: Thank you. Mr. Contos also runs one of the best restaurants in Boston. Anybody else? Would anybody else like to speak at this point? We're open and going to go and will change format at about six o'clock. We've got people booked much of the night, people who have made reservations. Does anybody wish to speak at this point? If no one wishes to speak at this point, why don't we recess until 5:30 because we'll expect more people then. We'll recess until 5:30.

[Recess proceedings.]

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now 5:30. Would anyone like to testify? Please go to sign up at the desk. As soon as anybody wants to put their views on record, we'll start hearing testimony.

[Recess proceedings.]

Ladies and gentlemen, for those of you who are just arriving, we are having a public hearing. We have opened the hearing to everyone who wants to speak. Anyone who wants to speak, please simply go to the sign-up desk and we'll start up the hearing as soon as anyone wants to testify. We'll recess until then.

[Recess proceedings.]

Again, if anyone wishes to testify and bring testimony on the projects we're discussing today, this is an open session until about six o'clock. We are booked at about six o'clock for the next few hours. So come and get it while they're hot. This is your chance.

This hearing will resume at six o'clock when we have a series of people on schedule. If anybody would like to give testimony at this time, we'd be glad to have it. City Councilor Larry DiCara will be here at six o'clock.

[Recess proceedings.]

MR. TIERNEY: It is six o'clock. May I have your attention, please? We will reopen this hearing, and for the benefit of those of you who haven't heard me before, I'll repeat some information you should know. If you want to testify and you haven't signed up prior to this hearing, go to the back of the room. And there may be free time in between the scheduled speakers if you want to testify and you haven't already signed up. And with that introduction, I'd like to call upon the next scheduled speaker, City Councilor DiCara.

MR. DiCARA: Thank you, Commissioner. Good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on an

issue that is crucial to the future not only of Boston, but also of the New England region as a whole.

The fate of the Central Artery and the question of whether we build a third harbor tunnel have been under study for over a decade. Now Transportation Secretary Salvucci has released the Environmental Impact Study report on the alternatives. After reviewing the E.I.S., as well as studies of Boston's economy prepared by the Boston Redevelopment Authority, I want to go on record in support of widening and depressing the Central Artery, and constructing a third harbor tunnel. I believe a joint project is the only practical solution, and I favor Alternative 5A modified.

Before getting into detail as to why I favor this particular alternative, I would like to speak in general about the value of this admittedly awesome transportation project. Boston is now enjoying a boom period -- two decades of growth and development following over 30 years of depression from 1929 to the early 1960s. So dramatic has Boston's revival been, that we now rank fourth -- behind only New York, Chicago and San Francisco -- in downtown market strength, in retail, hotel, and cultural facilities, as well as in housing development and employment concentration.

Between 1968 and 1982, private development investment was $6.8 billion, and another $3 billion is expected to be completed by 1986. Boston has gained a net of 46,000 new jobs since 1976.

I believe we are now at a turning point in the City's history. We can either ride the coattails of the economic growth we have recently achieved -- and the projections for the near term are bright -- or, we can make a bold decision to plan for the economic growth of the City and the New England region into the twenty-first century. Do we see ourselves as a charming, historic, provincial city currently enjoying better times? Or, can we accept Boston as one of the most dynamic cities in the nation, with interdependent links to the surrounding metropolitan area and the New England region beyond?

To me, the answer is obvious. Given the economic links between Boston and the surrounding area, and given the types of industries that are experiencing growth -- service industries and high tech products -- vehicular access is crucial to realizing the potential of the future.

Our recent surge of economic growth has put enormous pressure on our existing transportation

resources. When the Central Artery was built during the 1950s, Boston was immerging from a depression. Today, an average 150,000 cars use it each weekday. We are all familiar with the rush hour traffic jams. According to the B.R.A., Boston is projected to gain 93,000 jobs in the next decade alone. By 2010, the E.I.S. foresees all-day traffic jams on the Artery if capacity isn't increased.

Similar growth has been experienced at Logan Airport. Boston is a major national and international air terminal served by 34 airlines. The number of air travel passengers arriving and departing from Logan increased at an annual rate of five percent between 1970 and 1980. The value of air freight shipped overseas from the Boston customs region grew by over 800 percent in the last ten years. Logan is also important to the movement of the region's products destined for domestic markets. According to the E.I.S., an estimated 51 percent of the value of domestic air freight movements from Boston is generated by two industry groups -- machinery and electric machinery and equipment -- which requires same day or next day service. They are clearly dependent on timely access to Logan and since these two industry groups now account for one-third

of regional and statewide manufacturing employment, it is clearly in the City's interest that access be timely.

I believe that these growth statistics indicate the need for both the Third Harbor Tunnel and the widened, depressed Central Artery, but let me briefly consider the alternatives.

If we simply resurface the Central Artery, we will spend less money, we will have fewer years of construction, and less disruption of the surrounding street system to put up with. However, the flow of Expressway traffic will be impeded by closed lanes -- it is painful to even imagine the nightmare the rush hour will become -- and we will have nothing extra to show for our endurance, effort and the money we have spent. In addition, we will deny the City the opportunity to develop some 20 acres of air rights over the Central Artery. This development would rejoin the City, providing a transition between downtown and the Waterfront, increase the tax base, and provide thousands of new jobs.

If we built a third harbor tunnel without depressing and widening the Central Artery, we will improve access to Logan, but there will be no relief from north/south congestion. What good does it do to

build a third harbor tunnel if nobody can get to it because of bumper-to-bumper traffic on the Artery?

We could widen and depress the Central Artery without building a third harbor tunnel to Logan, but this would ignore our growing dependence on the time-sensitive air freight shipment of high tech products I mentioned earlier. If access to the airport does not improve, I believe it will be more difficult to attract new companies to the region and existing companies may be discouraged from expanding here.

Although I think the common good is best served by building both a third harbor tunnel and the depressed Centray Artery, I am aware that the project will produce some adverse impacts in the near term. The E.I.S. states that the build alternative could result in retail sales losses of up to five percent of the area's total during construction, or approximately $45 million per year. I see this is a problem, but not an insurmountable one. It is auto dependent sales to Downtown Crossing retailers which will be affected. The completion of the Red and Orange Line extensions should help offset this loss. The strength of the downtown retailers and the drawing power of Lafayette Place, which will soon open, give me confidence that we

can solve temporary access problems. Similarly access to the North End is likely to be affected by the loss of parking under the Central Artery. However, pedestrian access will be improved when the Central Artery comes down and no longer blocks the North End from downtown.

Of the build alternatives, I favor 5A modified. According to the E.I.S., it will have the largest impact on the regional economy during construction, generating $3.5 billion of so-called multiplier effects. It creates the least amount of traffic disruption to East Boston and the North End and will provide the largest savings in travel time. It provides direct access to the plan to seaport developments such as Boscom along the Waterfront, and creates six acres of likely development parcels in South Boston. This alternative takes no homes or businesses in East Boston. Many community leaders long opposed to earlier proposals for a third harbor tunnel support it.

The construction cost of Alternative 5A modified is over $2 billion. One way to put it into perspective is to note that the billions of private development investment Boston has received in the last

20 years has been leveraged by billions of public investment dollars -- almost $2.5 billion between 1960 and the mid-'70s. Since then there has been a steep decline in public investment due to budget constraints, a more costly bond market, and tax limitation legislation, among other reasons. A recent background study on infrastructure planning prepared by tha Boston Redevelopment Authority concluded that private development investment would proceed only for a short period without commensurate public infrastructure back-up. I believe that if we do not update Boston's transportation system, we will jeopardize the economic growth of the surrounding New England region, as well as the economic health of the City.

Securing the funds to build the joint tunnel artery project will require extraordinary cooperation betwaen City, State and Federal officials. As a candidate for mayor of Boston, I pledge my support for the project, and call on others to do tha same. Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: I'm going to call from the list of people who are prescheduled to testify now. Josepn Capola, a North Endar, is here. Will you give your address?

MR. CAPOLA: 172 Endicott Street in Boston. I come from the North End and I was around when they prepared the Central Artery the way it is today. The first time tney told us they were going to make it along Atlantic Avenue and out of town, but they changed it to cut right across the North End. They cut the North End in half. Now, in a way I'm glad they did it because they would have destroyed the Waterfront. Now this idea of depressing it sounds very good and I heard a lot of the pros and cons and mostly the pros that I was in favor of. That sheet of paper telling how they are going to make sure we don't lose our parking, not going to lose our access in and out of the North End, not going to disturb our businesses -- I believe that they should get at least the money to make the proposition proposed to other people and show what they are going to show for the good or bad, give the people a chance to find out. And I'm in favor of appropriating the money for that.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you. The next speaker on the prescheduled list is Rose Giambollo.

MS. GIAMBOLLO: My name is Rose Giambollo. I was born in the North End of Boston, graduated from St. Anthony's Grammar School, also Charlestown High

School. I lived in the North End all of my life, have never left it. I love Boston even though we have high taxes. I find Boston to be a very interesting city with very fine colleges and the best of hospitals. I believe it was in the year of 1950 when the Central Artery was first built. The people of the North End were very disappointed. It divided the North End from the downtown area. We felt isolated. The North End has began to call the Central Artery the Wall of China. We all felt we were being pushed aside and forgotten. But, of course, the Artery did help to solve some of the traffic problems at the time. Because of the large number of cars and trucks using this Artery, this has now outlived its usefulness. It is not large enough to handle the problems of the traffic we have today. Many people in this neighborhood like myself feel a deep need to depress the Central Artery and build a four-way lane with a breakdown lane running two ways to relieve the traffic congestion we now have. Workers coming into Boston will make better time going to their place of business and better time going to their homes in the evening plus alleviating many accidents. We all have so much to gain by depressing the Central Artery. We also need a third tunnel so that traffic to the

airport will be direct. This will also alleviate congestion and accidents in East Boston. I and other residents of the North End have faith in Secretary Salvucci, Secretary of Transportation, to be the man who can do the job and do it well. It will be in capable hands. People who have known Fred Salvucci have great respect and faith in him. He is a kind of a man who will do the job and do it well. I do hope you will give it your deepest consideration and approval for depressing the Central Artery plus a third tunnel. I thank you for giving me your full time and attention and hope for your final approval. That is all.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you for your testimony.

MS. GIAMBOLLO: You are welcome.

MR. TIERNEY: The next scheduled speaker is Michael DePisi.

MR. DePISI: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney. My name is Michael DePisi, and I was born at 27 Clark Street in the North End and was a North End resident for 28 years of my life. I now live in Wakefield, Massachusetts. I am presently a real estate developer and planner and I'm developing two parcels of property which are directly and indirectly affected by what happens with the Artery alternative. One building is a

Lincoln Wharf power station which is located on the Boston Waterfront which is being converted into 192 units for the North End families. And the other is a building at 247 Congress Street which is 100,000 square feet in the Fort Point Channel. As I stated before, I was born at 27 Clark Street, and I was named for my mother's brother whose name was Michael DiCaldo. His parents came over from Naples and over to 12 North Square where they had ten children. The reason I say that is I'd like to refer to Michael later on in my discussion. There are many obvious reasons which have been articulated today and have been discussed over the past year or two or three on the depression alternative and the reconstruction of the existing Artery. I have a unique perspective as one who was born in the community and lived with the Central Artery for as many years. Secondly, as someone who worked in a public agency that administer the tunnel and try to alleviate some of these adverse impacts on the community and presently as a real estate developer trying to develop around the community. I think most of us who understand the North End realize that the Artery was an environmental tragedy that imposed very serious social and cultural constraints to all of us growing up for our adolescent

and teenage years. There are many, many reasons, be they environmental or social or cultural to talk about studying the various engineering techniques in order to take this structure and place it underground. But most of us who have come to understand the North End realize that the business community is as viable to the North End as the residential side. I understand today there were business interests in here discussing the fact that they would like the Artery to stay as it is, a wonderful neighborhood and a wonderful abutter to them. The fact of the matter is when I was growing up, and of course pushcarts, peddlars was an integral part of the North End. When they left their revenues and garbage along Stone Street, on Saturday mornings and Saturday evenings, and the rodents and vermin came to frolic in it, nobody complained in the North End because we understood it was a viable part of the community. When Friday evening and Saturday mornings came and parking spaces in every lot and in every street was filled with outside residents coming in to buy from pushcarts, nobody complained because they understood it was a visible part of our community. The business interests haven't the relationship I have with Secretary Salvucci and both my affection and my respect. I know that he

has taken the time to consider all of these issues and will take the appropriate measures during a study process with people in competence willing to address each one of these issues at which point the business community would then be able to understand what impact the commonity presently lives with on a 24-hour basis and what the impact will be on a depression alternative. The fact that we have an opportunity to come down into this community and study this viaduct and be able to have again the opportunity to create 10, 15, 20 or 30 acres of developable or open space above it is a planner or developer's dream. Having worked with the Turnpike Authorities and seen the air quality count and seen and lived with the noise generated by the ventilation buildings, both on Clark Street and North Street, I can tell you that it would be a blessing if we could reduce traffic in both the Central Tunnel and Callahan Tunnel which would further reduce noise and air pollution. I'm sorry to say that there are many young people who live in the community still who I have spoken with who are very supportive of doing something constructive with the Artery such as placing it on the ground, but just won't take the time to hear and talk with us because they don't feel the government is

sensitive. I've helped the Secretary with over 30 meetings in homes and businesses in the North End in just the past two or three weeks to give a personal presentation to each of these constituencies to bring the North End into block-by-block basic understanding that as we traverse the arteries, the impact on a present basis and alternative are totally different. I think it is incumbent upon the State and Federal government to appropriate money where necessary in order to conduct its studies which again I know have been hashed and rehashed in both editorial pages in the Globe and Herald in the past six months. It is a sad, sad story when a community such as the North End does not come out here in full force to tell you about the cares and concerns when in fact those editorial writers who may be positive or negative are in fact determining the North End community. I think that the incentive is there by the State government at this time and those commitments have been made by the State government at this time to evaluate the best way to approach the engineering of this unbelievable project, and allocated from a developmental perspective and one of social, perspective. I really would love to take the opportunity to walk out of here today and go down to the North End

and see my Uncle Michael who I was named after and tell him about the fact that we came here this evening to tell you that we're very much interested in support of you taking this structure and placing it underground. But I can't. And the reason is when Michael was seven years old, he took his bicycle and went down to the mouth of the tunnel. At four o'clock in the afternoon a car sped out of the tunnel doing 90 miles per hour and hit Michael DiCaldo. His body was broken in 72 places. Parts of his bicycle were not found for five or six weeks. So if I can't think of any other important reason as to why we should take the tunnel connectors and place them on the ground and take the fact that the pedestrians have to cross the street, if that is the only reason that is to save another life, then let that be the only reason and take this abominable structure and place it where it belongs. Thank you very much.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you. My next scheduled speaker will be Robert Venuti.

[Whereupon, proceedings were suspended temporarily at 6:40 p.m.]

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

I, Nan L. Swartz, hereby certify that the foregoing record is a complete and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes taken in the above-entitled matter.

Nan L. Swartz

VOLUME: III
PAGES: 3-99
EXHIBITS: none

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 1983

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1983

11:00 A.M. - 11:00 P.M.

FANEUIL HALL
BOSTON

CORRIDOR PUBLIC HEARING FOR CENTRAL ARTERY, INTERSTATE ROUTE 93 AND THIRD HARBOR TUNNEL, INTERSTATE ROUTE 90 IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

ROBERT T. TIERNEY
COMMISSIONER

MARTHA A. REARDON
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ELLEN M. DiGERONIMO
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

KENNETH E. KRUCKEMEYER
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

JANE F. GARVEY
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ROBERT J. McDONAGH
CHIEF ENGINEER

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

I N D E X

Speakers	Page
Robert Lowe	3-3
Joseph Tassiarni	3-3
Emily Pugliano	3-4
Jeff Morgan	3-7
Gina Boland	3-13
Elaine Wilson	3-14
Walter McLaughlin	3-16
John Cogligliano	3-17
Roland Orlandi	3-20
Gary Ruben	3-28
Anthony Cataldo	3-29
Jim Rowes	3-31
Albert Tecci	3-33
George DiLorenzo	3-35
Marie Cargill	3-42, 51, 53, 57, 58, 62, 66, 69, 78, 80, 82, 85
Marie Ellen Welch	3-42
Ray Flynn	3-51
Mel King	3-53
Robert Edding	3-58
Robert Dimingo	3-66
James Casey	3-74
Lucie Parano	3-78
Gina Scalcione	3-80
Samuel DePaulo	3-82
Paul Marquis	3-84
John Kincaid	3-86
Cervan Towfig	3-90
Robert DiCara	3-91

MR. LOWE: My name is Robert Lowe and I live at 100 Commercial Street in Boston. I think most of the questions addressed to you about placing a residence and everything else I'm not quite sure what the study will find but I'm all in favor of it as long as we don't have any big major impact in the North End. I think the State made a mistake 25 years ago by separating everybody. The biggest fear I think for the waterfront people would be once you compress the artery what happens to the tides? We do have a water problem that once you start digging, I'm not sure what ramifications are being done by the waterfront area itself so I would like to, you know, just, whatever committee is in charge of this to really do a detailed study on that possibility. There are a lot of homes and apartments there. That is all I have to say on that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much. For those of you who have not been here since our opening remarks since eleven o'clock, we are taking testimony and we must respond to that testimony and file our impact statement which is due to be delivered to the federal officials by the end of September so any questions raised here are going or any questions raised in view of testimony, we must respond to that. All right. Next speaker to speak on the schedule is Joseph Tassiarni. Is there anybody that has not signed up previous

who wants to speak now are welcome to sign up now. The only thing we ask is that you look at the 10 minute rotation schedule of speakers. If there is nobody that wants to speak we will, we have scheduled speakers. Is there anybody that wants to speak? Do we have a scheduled speaker?

EMILY PUGLIANO: My name is Emily Pugliano. I am the president of the North End Neighborhood Task Force. I am a member of the City of Boston Environmental Commisaion and I am a life-long resident and property owner of the North End with no intentions or plans to move.

I wish to thank Secretary Salvucci for the opportunity to speak and to congratulate him on the sincere efforts to listen to, and inform, as many people as possible in such a short space of time. I will not dwell on past errors and injustices perpetuated against at least three communities and the City, as a whole, when the inadequate and ugly Central Artery was built. We can only go forward and plan for the future and this I am told is what this is all about. However, we are told the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow will be 13 years away. The question then arises on how do we get through these 13 years without serious health, safety and financial losses. I cannot give an unequivocal endorsement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement which is supposed to be Step No. 1. There are too many unresolved

and inaccurate statements. I will not take the narrow and parochial path and speak only of how much the North End will suffer and your engineers say we will get the worst of it. All of us in East Boston, Charlestown, the South End, South Boston and the North End are going to be hurt badly by a two billion dollar plan to bring more cars into the City and speed them on their way out of the City via the airport. Since we are also the tax payers who pay that two million dollars, it would seem that we are paying twice. The residents need the merchants and the merchants need us. Although you say there will be very limited land takings, there are job losses all along the route. There must be legal and written guarantees. We demand this. Goodwill and good intentions prevail now, but the Secretary cannot be everywhere. There will be deadlines to meet and powerful lobbies and unions to appease. Water backing up into my cellar, power failures, suffering merchants who must increase their prices to survive or move somewhere else, noise, dirt, rodents, rerouted transportation are some of the conditions which will turn a viable community into a wasteland. Undoubtedly the residents will be looked upon as expendable, but what about the thousands of people who come into the area to earn their living, attend our five educational institutions, partake of recreational facilities, et cetera. This is an enormous undertaking, but we cannot

lose sight of the fact that life must go on day in and day out. The Artery is your first priority, but not ours. Our utmost priority is survival as a community. So, again I say, we demand legal and written guarantees in all those areas in which survival is impacted whether it is jobs, equitable relocation costs, parking and traffic regulations in our favor as opposed to the construction workers, tax and insurance adjustments, et cetera. We have problems in the North End and it is dam hard getting the City or the State to listen. This project will only exacerbate them. It has been said that there was a whole class of Harvard that never knew what Harvard Square looked like because they were building a subway. That meant four years. Well, our kids have 13 years of misery to look forward to. By that time some of us in this room will be upstairs or downstairs with the angels or with the devil, having been transported there without the benefit of either a depressed or elevated Central Artery, but I happen to care about what happens to the next generation not only in the North End but about this whole City. We are a livable, workable City and lately I don't like what we are becoming. We don't have to become a highly polluted facsimile of L.A. with its freeways or have a skyline like New York when we have the beauty and dignity of the Charles River and our Harbor.

You tell us that land will free up when the

Artery is depressed. Just remember, that is our land. One of our boundaries used to be Scollay Square. North Street, Hanover Street, Salem Street, Endicott Street, TraverseStreet are in the North End now, used to be extended, and we now reclaim them. The project is just beginning and the thinking people of my neighborhood are full of ideas and we put you on warning that we will not be stifled as we were in 1950. Both you and us are a lot wiser and smarter. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: John Cammaratta or Jeff Morgan.

JEFF MORGAN: My name is Jeff Morgan, Sierra Club, 3 Joy Street, Boston. The Greater Boston Group of the Sierra Club welcomes this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Supplement to that Statement (DEIR/DEIS) on the Third Harbor Tunnel, and Interstate 90/Central Artery, Interstate 93. It is indeed a formidable document covering the largest highway project ever proposed in the Commonwealth. The Sierra Club hopes that the planners and engineers in the Massachusetts Department of Public Works will consider carefully all comments and criticisms of a project that has the potential for affecting millions of people daily.

Historically, the Sierra Club has supported the depression of the Central Artery with strong reservations

concerning the overall planning objective and the surface developments in particular. And the Sierra Club has traditionally opposed a third harbor tunnel because we felt that no overriding reasons to build had been forwarded and no coherent plan for Logan Airport development had occurred. Our sentiments have not been changed by the DEIR/DEIS. Some of our reasons follow.

Overall, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR/DEIS) indicates a number of positive benefits for the City. From the Sierra Club perspective, the most important opportunity is to repair the negative impacts that have resulted from building the Central Artery through the City's neighborhoods in the 1950's. Done correctly, a depressed Central Artery can be used to visually and physically unite the City. Without the elevated highway, noise can be reduced and air pollution channelled.

Where are the transportation/land use planning objectives of the State Planning Office of the first Dukakis administration?

Surface Developments: There is concern that the reconstructed surface area will continue to be designed based on a street, the new Surface Artery. The parcels depicted in Figure 101 indicate this. Why must there be a continuous new surface roadway? There must be much more

discussion by citizens, and then land use planning of the entire corridor, and only then a determination of the configurations and uses for the parcels and roadways. Perhaps it would be best if it was impossible to go between the Artery ramps, on the surface, so traffic will not be tempted to use the surface to pick-and-choose its entry onto the Artery. This planning and design aspect to the project must be done simultaneously with the continued planning of the depression project. This is especially true since additional footings for higher buildings over the depressed Artery must be constructed as the tunnel is being built.

No mention is made of when decisions on the new surface structures will be made. Who will be paying for the new foundations? The Federal Government? The Commonwealth? The anticipated developers? How tall will the new buildings be and how many of them will be built? These questions should be addressed now so citizens will have an opportunity to picture the final product of a depressed Artery.

Insufficient study has been given to the recreational and open space needs of the communities affected. What parks are now available and how can this project fill the gaps? It is not sufficient to add a little landscaped open space where convenient. Parks are a real urban environmental

need that must be met. There is no reason to depress the Central Artery if the end result will be surface conditions that still divide the City, hinder pedestrian traffic, and add no recreational areas.

Water Quality: The Artery project conflicts geographically with two proposals that are essential and would drastically upgrade the water quality in Boston Harbor and on Boston beaches. These two projects are: the M.D.C. Combined Sewer Overflow Facility planned for the head of the Fort Point Channel and the West Side Interceptor at Atlantic Avenue. These projects should be completed as a prerequisite to this project. The raw sewerage from all downtown is presently running into the harbor and this project will obstruct its correction at a later date.

Tunnel Alternatives: Traditionally, the Sierra Club has opposed a Third Harbor Tunnel. Our primary reasons stem from the failure to consider the impact of an ever-expanding Logan Airport. While we recognize the potential benefits of diverting airport traffic off of the Central Artery, we fail to see how this traffic can be controlled once it arrives at an airport with limited parking. If the greatly expanding commercial traffic is considered, it appears that a Third Harbor Tunnel will only serve to increase traffic and lead to increased air and noise pollution.

Why is the use of our regional airports, like Worcester or Bedford, not considered for diverting some of the commercial traffic going to Logan? The ever-expanding use of Logan Airport must be curtailed to prevent future traffic tie-ups, and increased air and noise pollution. There is an overwhelming need to set up a regional (Massachusetts or New England) air and surface transport board to coordinate the use of our airports and major surface arteries. Such a board could ensure that New England businesses had a reliable and close-to-home way to get their products distributed throughout New England and the world. Such a board could also encourage redistribution of passenger traffic throughout the region. Citizen participation is a must on such a board.

Public Transit: The planning of the Combined Expressway-Tunnel Project is fatally flawed by the total absence of any analysis of possible new public transportation access to Logan Airport, nor or any possible creative public transportation use of the expanded capacity of the proposed depressed Central Artery. It is the position of the Sierra Club that unless and until such planning is included, we are opposed to a Third Harbor Tunnel.

The project before us proposes a substantial increase in capacity of the Central Artery and a doubling of the cross-harbor capacity to East Boston and

Logan Airport. It is the Sierra Club's position that some of this increased capacity must be devoted to improved public transportation.

Conclusion: Those responsible at the Department of Public Works must broaden their policy objectives to generally integrate other design disciplines, and not merely pay them lip service. The necessary balance requires that adequate budgets for urban design, landscaping, joint development, and participation by city planning and urban design departments be built into these projects at the earliest stages. Otherwise we shall be doomed to mediocre plans inspite of the billions to be spent.

To maintain minimum standards for the proposed projects provision must be made for:

1. urban design control of the highway engineering proposals;
2. design control of the streetscapes and open spaces;
3. design control of joint development.

This can be accomplished by including professionals from outside of the Department of Public Works. In addition, citizens should continue to be a part of all planning stages and be able to choose professionals to help them in their reviews. Of course, budgets must be included for these groups.

It is imperative with a project of this size that public participation continue to be a major force for change. The Sierra Club is encouraged by Secretary Salvucci's efforts so far in working with citizen groups. We look forward to continuing our dialogue as the planning for the Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel moves on in any format. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Submitted by Jerry Ivers, Elizabeth Johnson, William Lamb, John Lewis, Louise Lewis, Ernest Lowenstein, Jeffrey Morgan, and Nancy Seidman for the Greater Boston Group of the Sierra Club.

GINA BOLAND: I live at 172 Endicott Street, North End, Boston. I am 23 years old, a life-long resident of the North End. What moved me to come up here and speak was that no young people are coming out and the only reason I'm here is that my father spoke earlier. I would like to say I'm for the project all the way. I would say after looking at the maps I think we have to go forward and I have been driving for five years now and I know when I can move my car and when I cannot move my car and that there are a lot of things, sometimes you cannot move your car because of traffic and the Expressway is just a messy sight. I would like to see it developed and I would also like to say I go along with the woman from the North End who spoke about getting everything

written down and guarantees that we will get land back after the 12 years. I will be 34 years old when it is done and probably have small children and I would like to bring them out there and have them make the guarantees that the business will not suffer too much and we will get the parking facilities. That is just my comments and I thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is John Cammaratta here? Our next scheduled speaker is Elaine Wilson.

ELAINE WILSON: I am a life-long resident of the North End and I am not going to tell you how old I am. I enjoy living in the North End and I want to stay here. We also own a property that we live on, 14th Street which is quite near the Expressway.

THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me. The acoustics are terrible. I think if you spoke as close to the mike as possible it might help.

MS. WILSON: I am also director of the North End Community Health Center and I am also director of a nursing home. I am greatly concerned about the problem, the one that we have facing us right now and the impact and decision may be on our community and residents and our property. I have been to many information meetings and heard so far that I'm hard pressed to understand how anyone could make with any intelligent decision as to whether or not we should support

the depression of the Artery. Therefore, we should come forward and oress the government to really study this problem and further, any imoact analysis and probleme that have been raised by many people such as noise, pollution during construction and water tables which we will suffer from this, we have to maintain our buildings after they settle, after construction and the closeness of the walls that are going to be supporting the Artery. I think questions really need to be studied further before any decision is made and I'm sure we will, with the towne and expertise of people that live in communities, they together will be able to make this decision and it will be a good one and I also would like to go on record by saying that I really love being in Boston and people who live here pay heavy and dearly for the privilege of living in Boston.

I think it is somewhat unfair becauee regardless of whatever happens to the Artery the people who tend to benefit from it the moet are the people who live in surburbia and yet the Boetonians pay such an unproportionate share for car ineurance.

For example, beceuee of traffic and the things that happen in Boston I don't know quite how the Commissioner determines who gets what rate but Boetonians pay $1,200 and suburbia will pay $300. I would like to see that

while the investigations are being done as to what to do with the Artery that this consideration be made to remedy the situation which now exists which are thoroughly unfair to us. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I'd like to comment on the issues by some of the last few speakers. This is the first step and indeed it is the first step toward what will eventually or what may eventually be deciding process during the design process. We will be working with the North End community and the fact that they are affected by what we propose to do and because of the issues that have been raised in public hearinge by you we must address how we are going to handle those issues. If we do so in our final environmental impact.

WALTER McLAUGHLIN: My name is Walter McLaughlin and I am an attorney and I am also the owner of a slice of what is known as the State Street block building which practically abuts the present Artery. That building is a historical building built in 1856 which once had very close connections with the sea. Stretched far longer than it does, in fact, a large portion of it was torn down when the original Artery was built.

The Artery as it exists presently cuts that building off from the sea which was the historic route.

The depression of the Artery will bring that building closer to the sea and bring it closer to the substantial development which is taking place across the other side of the Artery, the Aquarium, the new hotel and the other building on that side and will reunite that building with its historic heritage and for that reason I think it is a very great idea to want to depress that Artery and get rid of the block that which is there and has been there for 20 years and only wish you depress the Artery and restore old buildings which was once there and which was longer and more beautiful and repreeented a very good part of the history of this City.

I think that is a very excellent project and I support it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Now, the next scheduled speaker is John Cogligliano.

JOHN COGLIGLIANO: Mr. Tierney, I appreciate the opportunity to be at this public hearing today to present the personal views of the Safety Traffic Department on the depressed Cantral Artery of Boeton and for the propoeed conetruction of the Harbor, Third Harbor Tunnel. First of all, I want to commend the federal and state agencies that have been involved in setting up this process which in the 13 years that I have been involved in the public sector on a number of issuee many of which have been in the transportation

area, this has surely been the most open and comprehensive and accesible project for the public at large.

I think it would be a tremendous boon to the parking needs, particularly the needs of the City of Boston.

We realize that the Central Artery must be imoroved, major improvements such as the widening of the present Artery and clearly we are going to be at a point where we are not, people, shoppers in particular who now use the City of Boston are going to be forced to make other decisions to avoid shopping in Boston because they will not be able to use the Central Artery so that again at least the comfort of it so I am certainly in support of this particular project.

I recognize, however, that with any large oroject such as this one that there are certain inevitable conesequences that have to do with the construction of the project that must be taken into account, research of the environmental and community integrity of the areas proposed, construction that are to be taken are also very close to. One of the particular neighborhoods in Boston that has raised some very legitimate concerns about some of the potential construction of this proposed Central Artery and that is of the North End, and I want to say to you and the representatives of the Federal Highway Administration that our department will

work very closely with the number of community leaders in the North End with respect to finding ways of designing and implementing and mediating that can be used to offset any of the proposed impact of the construction project itself.

Last week we submitted to the City Council at his request a very detailed account of the kind of roads that our department can utilize which now is accessible to us to essentially provide if you will around the North End during time of construction so that we, the North End, would not be used for through traffic from any of the existing use of the Cantral Artery. It would clearly be protected from any impact the construction equipment that would be taking tied to the project itself and thet report has been in the North End and will be submitted to you and which will be forthcoming from our department within the next couple of weeks before the August 22 deadline.

All I could say is this is a general statement of support for the project with detailed analysis and to follow in a written form so that I want to assure you that my department is clearly in support of the Central Artery project and commends you for the process that youhave devised in implamenting and the public support and the importance of thia project and the details to be forthcoming in the next couple of weeks. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Before I call the next scheduled speaker I'm going to take a two minute recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was then taken.)

THE COMMISSIONER: We are back on the record. The next scheduled speaker is Roland Orlandi.

ROLAND ORLANDI: My name is Roland Orlandi and I live at 120 Commercial Street and I am a lawyer and have an office at 141 Tremont Street. I am a life-long resident of the North End and I have raised my family there. My family has been in the North End ever since my father landed from Italy when he was a small boy. I am also a former State Representative and I have been a State Representative for six years from the Third Suffolk District of which the North End was my home base. The Third Suffolk District comprised of the North End and half of Beacon Street and Charles River Park and about a third of the South End.

I think a good portion of your plans here lie in what was my former District. I'm not going to testify that I represent anyone but myself at this point in time but I would like to inform and have heard is my feeling that the Fitzgersld Expressway or the Central Artery as recantly known in my opinion was a savage mistake and I hate to say to you, since it was done by a former member of the Department of

Public Works, God rest his soul, and I look at that Artery and I curse him and have to ask forgiveness for all of that. If there was a mistake done in the late 1940's and I remember it being built, I was about to start high school when they were throwing down or performing the demolition work for the Expresaway.

If there was a mistake then there is a worse mistake now if we let that Expresaway stand and if we don't take the opportunity to do something to improve it. We say it's an ambient in our neighborhood. An ambient that is being destroyed by the great walls of the Central Artery. It is isolating us from the rest of the City. It has put us in a box and that I always resented people who walked by and asking how do we get to it.

I can remember when I lived about a half a block of the construction and in school studying, the private driveways and the noise and the dust and diaruption of our City, to this day you cannot walk up Hanover Street anymore. That would not have been so bad if we got in return something decent. We got this elevated highwsy that we do not get on to most of the day. What we have now, and I did spend a good part of my time as State Representative calling local police divisions, one to clean up the drugs and the bums and the pickpockets out from underneath that Expressway, one of the

worst things that has happened as a result of the Expressway. We are limited in our accass in and outside of the North End. We are forced to go out by Haymarket Square which has vehicles traversing it over in every singla direction, buses and traffic jams. There is no way to cross at that point.

We have to go underneath that Expressway. The cars come out of the tunnel and the other alternative, the mouth of the tunnel, we have what I call the North End roulette, the only difference between the North End roulette and the Russian roulatte is that you can see the bullets coming at you. In Russian roulette you don't see the bullets. The cars are coming out of that tunnel, they come whipping out and it goes -- it is a miracle that peopla have not been killed on either Cross Street or under the tunnel. Maybe it is just the sign that we have kept our deafness in crossing in front of the tunnel because there are no other ways to go. The other wey to go is to cross down by Commercial Street and cross behind Faneuil Hall and there again there are so many traversing vehicles.

I was standing on the sidewalk in the middle of the Surface Artery and almost got run over by some woman who cut in front of a taxi cab and to avoid her he almost landed on my lap. It is an insanity. It is an absolute insanity. This Expressway, I'm not talking about the way it

carries traffic. I think that it is important that those who live in and out of the City, they want to go by us and over us and under us. Let them go whichever way they want, what concerns me is the quality of our life, the quality of what happens to us who live in the City and stay in the City and who remain behind. I have looked at your summary. I have read it over and see the difference between your different plans and you have plan 3-A, 5-A, all very nice numbers and up to the year of 1990. It would seem to me plan 5-A would produce the best traffic perhaps and the best solution. I'm not an engineer and I won't comment on that. However, what it does appear to me by your plan 5-A it will relieve our city streets and some of the traffic that comes off of that Expressway and some of the tourists were forced to all go through the North End to find their way to Faneuil Hall or anywhere else. At the present time they are forced to come through the North End to get by the North End. This puts a tremendous load on our City. We have problems with parking and traffic and all sorts of problems with just the numbers of people and vehicles that exist in our neighborhood.

I think the City has, lately, been doing a better job about handling the parking. What I don't want to see is that any of this, what I call baloney about parking, so many parking spaces will be lost under the Expressway and

that is a lot of garbage. North Enders, no city people use any of that parking. It is all done and all for private parking lots, operators go at the end of the day and when the North Enders were able to park under the Expressway the City took that away from us. The North Enders cannot afford to pay $14 and $15 and $16 a day for parking and they do not park under the Expressway. Don't let anyone buffalo you into believing that these parking spaces, that the disappearance will make any difference in the North End. They won't. North Enders don't use them. To us they are just a place where the people from Faneuil Hall can park their fancy automobiles and go home at night and leave us behind with the drunks and problems they leave us. If we can find a way to decrease that Artery and depress ourselves in some way by some construction, whether it be parking changes in the way the streets are set up, we get somewhat separated from those people and we will keep away their drunks and noise and rowdiness and the stuff they don't want to see, preserve our neighborhoods and not as it is but for us who lived there and always live there and those who lived there and went through the hard times and not only those who lived there when the good times were around.

I in the past have opposed the Third Harbor Tunnel after reading the plans, after studying the alter-

natives and the way this particular thing works, I think it is this problem, there is no other way to go then to set up a Third Harbor Tunnel. I don't know exactly what your plan 3-A or 5-A will work best for you or the people of the South End. All I know it will create problems for them as well but if some Third Harbor Tunnel is not built now I fear it will be built in the future at that point in time. I think the option for the people in the neighborhood will be fewer than they exist today that the people in the neighborhood will have no say about where those options are and how the roads will run because at that point in time they will be tied into whatever is done as it is set up today. I also fear that a no-build alternative is a -- a no-build alternative I think that will create major problems for us up and around the Expressway. A no-build alternative means that people will be coming down off that Expressway and down onto lower local streets to run around Atlantic Avenue, the Commercial Street, Cross Street are going to be jammed with cars. There are going to be coming down off that Expressway and try to avoid the Central Artery and when they arive at the Centrel Artery there is no place to go but our backyard, Hanover Street will be probably another raceway.

What I do hope though, after your September 30th deadline goes by, if you set up a plan that half, some considerations and some explanations of what plans the State

has to develop the 20 acres that will become available and most of them will become available in those areas that bound the North End. I think that would be the most important thing that will happen in the North End. Our biggest problem at this point in time are parking and pedestrian access to the rest of the City. And Hanover Street, Cross Street, Clinton Street, Commercial Street and Haymarket Square, how you people look at it, what you people intend to do with the City, even participation, I know that the Department of Public Works and other areas of the City have had participation and I would like to see done what you people have for alternatives, I hope it will not be turned over to the City but to the local and North End people and perhaps it should be done by votes within the North End itself, who will represent the people of the North End.

I don't represent them, I am here as a private citizen. I would like just to say one thing. I'm here as a private citizen because I have been a life-long resident of the North End. I am perhaps one of the few people who has made enough money and who has moved out and has not moved out and half the people of whom I went to grammar school with, there is me and one other girl who are still residents of the North End. That has been traditional of the North End, they make a dollar and they leave. Some of the people come

back and businessmen tell us how to live. We don't want them to tell us how to live. We want to live the way we want to live. That does not mean we don't have concerns for the businessmen. They are our friends as we need them and they need us and I think their concerns should be handled and should be taken into consideration.

I did see that you had in your plans that there would be a difference between something like 2 percent and 5 percent for your business problems. A business loss in central areas of the City. I think that the North End could probably end up in the upper part of that scale but we would like to see what can be done to mitigate those losses, what can be provided for the North End businessmen by way of parking perhaps, by shuttle buses, perhaps shuttle walks or ways to get back and forth to the businesses so that the businesses are not disrupted. Some businesses will experience more and some businesses will experience less, what I feel and I understand this is your first step in that direction is to find a plan for the Federal Government so that you can come up with the money so you can provide the engineering plans to develop this kind of process. I hope that in this process these kinds of considerations are taken in by you and that perhaps you will open your access, also again to North Station which we had not had for many years and maybe with the de-

pression of the Artery, North Station once again will become available again to the North End. Not an area for drunks. It is depressing when we go through these areas one walks close to the walkway, we don't need and want that. We have a family area and we want to raise our families here and we want our elderly people who are here and we want them to stay here and we want them to be safe.

We have fewer areas and that is one of the few areas that people can go out at night. The Central Artery, I would pay for the tombstone, I would be happy to pay for the tombstone and to have one side stating up there which is now John Fitzgerald Expressway and we hereby bury thee John Fitzgerald Expressway.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

GARY RUBEN: My name is Gary Ruben. I am corporate clerk of the works on 365 Franklin Street, Boston. I am a life-long resident of Washington, D.C. and, therefore, I am unbiased. I would like to say this would be the first step in solving the traffic problems of Boston. In the words of Howard Cosell, "Maybe to little to late." Let's not confuse the issue that I am unbiased. This is not a question of what neighborhood would be affected.

What would the depressing of the Artery achieve? Will it depress the flow of traffic? I think that

there is a psychological affect on those people who drive slower. I don't think it will ease the flow of traffic and coming from Washington and we had a recent problem with major traffic construction, you ought to consider the fact that when the first shovel hits the ground that the price of depressing the Artery will triple or quadruple and my final comment is should a Central Artery be in the center of the City. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Anthony Cataldo.

ANTHONY CATALDO: My name is Anthony Cataldo and I am a resident of the North End area. I am a member of the Massachusetts and National Association of Sanitariums and I am also a certified health officer and vice president of Massachusetts Health Officers Association and I am director of Environmental Health for the City of Boston so you can see that I have some interest in the project of this nature and insofar as the implemental impact is concerned and also insofer as I say as noise and pollution is concerned.

I am also president of the St. Mary's Housing Corporation which is a nonprofit group, St. Mary's Casa Maria, a housing for the elderly which adjoints the Expressway, also a life member of that particular area.

I personally come here tonight in fevor of the depressing of the Central Artery and I also speak for the

tenants of the Casa Maria and many of the tenants and property owners abutting the area because many times they have come up to me insofar as complaining about the noise, pollution at night and, of course, nothing done about it.

When this monster was built I was too young to express my opposition. We have heard mention many times that the greatest parking space in the area is the Arterial Expressway and it is getting worse by the day. Right now we are at the crossroads of federal funds will be available so it is time to act to get these funds or else if we dicker among ourselves and if we fight and try to postpone it these funds will go to some other state. So it is time to act. Depress the Expressway especially since no homes will be taken and I know there are petitions around the area specifying that by depressing the Artery many homes will be taken and, of course, from the plans and from the, my reading of it there will be no displecement of any family in the North End.

Therefore, we should be in favor of it and I wish to congratulate the Secretary of Transportation to have the foresight and determination to proceed with these hearings and finally to obtain his goals if the Artery is not depressed what is going to happen. It is getting old. It is falling apart. It has to be fixed and then in so doing many of the lanes will have to be closed and much of the traffic will be

diverted through the streets of the North End creating a pollution and noise problem. After it has been completed what have we gained? We have gained nothing. It is the same Expressway. The same lanes and everything. The traffic will be just as bad or worse, also by depressing the Expressway there will be available about 20 acres of land which could be useful for either parking spaces, building of new homes, building of business and bringing taxable taxes to the City of Boston which it needs it so bad. All of this and there will be more jobs also we should all be in favor of proceeding with this. There will be a study and engineering plan and will be a part of the procedure and if by any chance the community is not involved in the future plans then we can oppose it. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

JIM ROWES: My name is Jim Rowes and I thank you for your time tonight. I really appreciate this. I think the idea of depressing the Central Artery -- I am a resident of Salem so excuse me if I am not a resident of this great City but I certainly experience the traffic problems as much as many people around this area do. I live about 20 miles north and in any event, I think the idea of depressing the Artery makes a lot of sense as many of the people here have mentioned it, the North End particularly has been seperated

from the rest of the City and we have a real problem with air pollution and traffic pollution and I think this idea really makes sense and if it can be kept reasonable and that is only for the Federal Government to decide. He loves to spend money as it is. This would really make good sense. I think it is going to help a number of areas not only the North End, the North End will be enhanced by it. I think it is a great idea. Why don't we take North Station, too. That would be a better idea then we will have a new Boston Garden and right now the Boston Garden looks like Fort Apache in the Bronx. That is my idea. That is another issue.

As far as the Third Harbor Tunnel is concerned I think that is maybe the greatest waste of money that this City could ever conceive of. I think it's time for the people to start thinking of public transportation and start taking advantage of it. The one-way tolls have already cut down on the traffic volume or traffic overflow tremendously. So I don't say they will solve all of the problems but I think public commitment and the idea to use mass transportation will solve that problem in due time. So I think the moneys are best spent number one in depressing the Artery and cleaning up North and South Station. When people come to Boston they notice how poor the transportation is and putting the money in the Third Harbor Tunnel I know is the biggest waste of

public money, I know Ed King is in Winthrop and he probably doesn't care so let us go for the Artery end clean up the North End and clean up the North Station and South Station and the idea of the Third Harbor Tunnel is just, it just does not make any sense and I thank you for your time.

THE COMMISSIONER: I want to take about a four-minute break.

(Whereupon a short recess was then taken.)

THE COMMISSIONER: I would like to go back on the record. There are people that have signed up and testified who are apparently not here yet. I will try and call their names again. Fred Carangelo and John Cammaratte. Neither are here. I would like to say that Mr. Albert Tecci testified earlier but because of gaps he is going to testify again.

ALBERT TECCI: Thank you, Commissioner, for giving me the opportunity to speak again and voice my opinion and the opinion of the group of specifically that I spoke for. The reason I asked to speak again this evening was because having listened to proponents march up here and give information which I hope was not intentional or falsification or fabrication which I would like to believe which was lack of common sense. There are those petitions that

sey homes and families will be taken. It is a fact. It is a fact according to the draft of the Environmental Impact Study that the quality of life in the North End would be affected. It will be affected to the point where people might went to move out of the North End because of the deterioration and of business, quality of life, noise, pollution and so in a sense the State has not physically removed people from their homes but instead they mentally, through psychology, forced people from their homes by giving them a poor quality of life.

I would also like to address a number of people that have come up here, different organizations or for other people and I question every one of them ---

THE COMMISSIONER: I am going to interrupt you. You are not going to debate and if you have additional testimony, fine, but not in reference to what somebody else has given.

MR. TECCI: Well, okay. The last thing I went to address is the fact that once again that in all of the testimony heard from consultants from transportation and from City officials from public leaders in the North End and other neighborhoods, all the proponents have yet to show facts that there will be any improvement in the North End and I state that when we submit our report all of the facts on the adverse conditions that face it and the quality of life. The people

will be the truth. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. George DiLorenzo.

GEORGE DiLORENZO: Mr. Chairman, John DiLorenzo. I have been a resident all my life in Boston, one fortunate enough, one fortunate enough to have played a role as a legislator for the people of my area in East Boston. However, I feel very fortunate to think that I was a little boy in the first tunnel, a medium age person in the second tunnel and an old man in the third tunnel. The experiences are still very active in my memory. In the first tunnel we were told after 20 years of only 5 cents through the tunnel East Boston and North End people will travel free guaranteed, don't concern yourselves about it you people from the East Boston and the North End. Well, the rate went to 15 cents. Well, they decided when the secretary of Boston was going to solve all the problems particularly those in East Boston and the North End that there would never be a problem of traffic forever and we tried to say if the first one really did not work what makes you think the second one will? Well, because we made a mistake on the first one. We were told the people of East Boston at many meetings but we have the finest and the best in the world on the second tunnel and along comes the Callahan Tunnel and he builds the second tunnel.

Now we have the third tunnel. Here is the

message. They are telling us that this third tunnel will be the best. We are trying to tell you we don't want a third tunnel and they are all saying this will relieve a problem but we say don't relieve the problem, we have no problem. We are living with the problems. Don't relieve it because you cannot, this third tunnel will not relieve the present problem.

If I may be permitted to go to my chart I will be glad to show you. This is nothing that was created. This is a chart of the island, not an island, East Boston from the North Shore, from the North Shore, there are 58,000 automobiles per day that the North Shore, in this case, the North Shore is that line. Marblehead, Swampscott and so forth. Now, the northwest which is Route 1, 30,000 cars make trips per day that is coming down from the Route 1, we have from Winthrop, 21,000 car trips per day and, of course, through the turnpike north, 66,000 car trips per day and through the Port Authority 50,000 car trips a day. When this was created we were told that there would be absolutely no need for a second tunnel or a third tunnel because geographically East Boston is unable to take this without jeopardizing the present problem. So the only way they could possibly come through this with this is to bring in either way back into Charlestown, God forbid in that area or a little further out where

an engineer can approve another hole would be acceptable.

Now, if you are going to decide on the validity of this, please tell me where these cars are going in the third tunnel. Are you telling me or are you telling -- incidentally, these statistics are ten years old, this figure is, I believe, 12 to 15 percent greater. If you were going to tell me that the third tunnel would allow all of these people to go through the third tunnel to go through the third tunnel then I would try to agree that the feasibility of the third tunnel is practicable. I want to review this point so I can get this clear.

They are coming to East Boston and they give us three plans. The first plan says ladies and gentlemen, citizens of East Boston and North End. Do you want another tunnel. Nobody cares about those statistics and the answer would be no but they don't ask us that. They ask us take the plans, pick one, which one will it be, the one on the left, the one on the right? Plan B? Plan C? Which one? But of course, that is not it. That is not the thing we want. Let us suppose, Mr. Commissioner, this becomes reality, the second tunnel, the expansion of it, 150 trucks went on transporting all this dirt and dust for years, not weeks, not months, for years. When I tell you that when a person was making spaghetti gravy there was sand in it flying all over

the place it was impossible to live in that area. We could not do a thing but because they said it is an open hole we finally did something and stopped the traffic. I would hope that we would be looking at this as practical people.

Consider the fact that the people are not interested in the third crossing because it will not relieve this problem where will this traffic go? Don't forget they say we are expected in the 25 percent increase in 10 years and that will make up on the third tunnel. Isn't it practical, Mr. Commissioner, to take these 58,000 trips a day and sort of circumvent around here somewhere? A bridge or something to the third or to the bridge and connect it that way? For some reason the tunnel seems to be an interest of bad influence. I won't talk about the spillover on the streets. Do you know what a spillover is? To leave at quarter of seven to go to Revere, I live on Jeffrey Point and I cannot get out of my section because they are spilling over from the highway and they are taking all those streets and coming this way and closing into the tunnel. This spillover is there every day and every evening and every time somebody comes over. This will not be relieved by a third tunnel. As a matter of fact, it will give the third tunnel people an opportunity to seek relief by doing spillovers and nothing has been added except all the traffic flows during the construction of the

tunnel.

In other words, the interest and the safety of the people of my community is unimportant but the direction is always influencing a tunnel and so I can go on and tell you about the noise and pollution. We have an extreme problem with noise and pollution with the airport and tunnel and automobiles now would, with a third tunnel relieve that? The answer is no because it is supposed to bring more automobiles in that area. I would like to talk about the things they tell us. I think that my people here would tell you about the wonderful things they say, gee, just think of the economical value. You and you and you will go to work on the tunnel and you will be collectors, you may be an inspector of the tunnel. You can be the maintenance. It will take everybody in East Boston and North End and we heard that in the first tunnel and the second tunnel. I dare you to tell us this in the third one. I double dare you to tell me. You better not.

I would like to again repeat so we can get this thing understood is there anyone here in East Boston who wants a third tunnel? And the answer appears it is no. Have you been asked whether or not you want a third tunnel or not? No. They are asking you, pick one. You want Plan A? Plan B? Plan C? We are telling you we don't want it.

I am now going on to the economic issue.

I'd like to tell you about the community, oh, if you were born in East Boston or many, if you only were born in East Boston and the North End you know what the family duties are. In case you want to park the car for only $4 a day and go away for 90 days you can go into East Boston. We were never informed of where the boundary of the airport was, but this is not an important worry. This is a supplement to the airport. If you have any power over it and fortunately we are thinking about changing our codes and zoning laws so that we can say we don't need any more car rentals, car parking lots and shipping and parking and transportation. We have enough of that.

Now I would like to go on and I know people are going to be interested in giving you the coalition from East Boston, I'm going to leave you with the specs. Unlike the others that came to East Boston and told us if you do this we will give you that and we will do this and do that. Let me give you the terminology that they would use. They said that it was important for them to have the National Guard and the Civil Defense and the Port Authority, there and if the Germans were to drop the first bomb it would be important to have the Port Authority and the National Guard there. So we thought about it. Did you know that Boston was so close that they could push a button and in 15 minutes we could get a

bomb and they decided, of course, we will keep the National Guard there because somebody had told the National Guard is to get rid of the buildings and put in a State building there in which they could oversee the Port Authority and transportation but they needed it and finally they convinced the State not to sell it and 11 weeks later they bought the National Guard building and tore it down.

So in conclusion of this you decide to either wait and let's talk it over and solve it working with East Boston and we will give you a survey of East Boston and the North End. With those statistics. Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Because there are a number of people here who were not here earlier I would like to describe some ground rules that I think are beneficial for everybody who are going to testify. The ground rules of the schedule of speakers who have preregistered I'm going to call upon the schedule of speakers. If there are speakers scheduled who are not here and I have the opportunity I will call upon people who are in the back of the room and possibly because of tonight, between eight and nine it would be more likely between nine and eleven. We requested nine and eleven, we will resume at eleven tomorrow morning. If for any reason you want your opinion heard you do not want to testify in public you can put your thoughts in writing and send it to

D.P.W., 100 Nashua Street, Boston, and assuming we get your response between two weeks that will become part of the public hearing as if you testified here tonight. We are trying to limit the speakers to eight minutes with varying exceptions. I will not make an issue on that unless I have to and with that introduction I would like to call on the next scheduled speaker. Gina Scalcione.

MARIE CARGILL: I am not Gina Scalcione. This is a coalition against the Third Harbor Tunnel. Good evening, everyone. My name is Marie Cargill, I will be facilitating the flow of the ideas, and redefinements of hundreds of East Bostonians as they are voiced tonight by their appointed spokespeople and representatives. These ordinary people, some of whom lived through the history of the two tunnels in this neighborhood realizing the full negative impact of yet a third tunnel to their lives and to their communities nowdawiftly to begin with a combined effort to prevent a third harbor crossing thus a coalition of these people, these local organizations and East Boston groups came together to form a coalition against a third tunnel.

The first speaker will be Marie Ellen Welch who will represent the impact of the traffic and will give the coalition's position paper.

MARIE ELLEN WELCH: I am a life-long

resident of East Boston. I am here tonight representing the airport traffic relief which I am a member of the coalition against the third harbor tunnel. The coalition is here specifically to address the issue of what we consider to be a billion dollar project. We recognize the traffic congestions, a major problem. Especially on East Boston side, two tunnels instead of waiting for the billion dollars of our tax payers' money we think you can get by and address the problems and resolve it with a very small fraction of that amount if the creative minds of the City and State and Federal Government got together for once. What the real problem is is the quality of life in the City. The position statement of the coalition against a third tunnel is that the coalition against a third tunnel opposes the construction of any third harbor tunnel because the coalition believes any new crossing would encourage the uncontrolled growth of Logan Airport and airport-related services and traffic into surrounding residential communities. A new tunnel would discourage the use and development of public transportation, increase the use of private cars and delay alternative projects to ease congestion in the existing tunnels.

Furthermore, the coalition is convinced that the State has not adequately evaluated many potential environmental, social and economic problems a third harbor

tunnel would create, and has ignored many inexpensive alternative transportation solutions. We believe the one billion dollar price tag on a third harbor tunnel is too much to spend for a traffic problem. Boston needs a solution to a complex regional transportation problem that reaches far beyond the needs addressed by a single purpose harbor tunnel.

Many people endorse a third tunnel without fully understanding the tremendous effects on the environment, the social fabric and the local economy during and after construction. We believe that inadequate transportation studies and policies have contributed to the popular misconception that Boston is in dire need of a third tunnel.

The coalition proposes the following alternatives to a third tunnel, and we urge the State to explore these and other options thoroughly before considering plans for any further harbor crossing:

- improved Central Artery and access to existing tunnel traffic;
- permanent one-way toll system;
- improved public transit and incentives to use it;
- extensive ferry network; and
- cap on Logan Airport growth.

The members of our coalition besides the community groups include former Lt. Governor Thomas P. O'Neill

III. Former State Representative Mel King. Boston City Counselor Ray Flynn, Boston City Counselor Frederick Langone, Cambridge City Counselor David Sullivan, Governor Michael Dukakis, Airport Impact Relief Inc., East Boston Area Planning Action Council, East Boston Fair Share and Massachusetts Fair Share, East Boston Concerned Citizens for Public Safety, East Boston Harborside Community School, Gove Street Citizens Committee, Jeffries Point Harborside Neighborhood Association, East Boston Land Use Advisory Council and Massachusetts League of Women Voters. Its supporters are United States Senator Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senator Paul Tsongas, United States Representative Thomas P. Tip O'Neill, United States Representative Edward Marky, Boston Mayor Kevin H. White, former Joint Transportation Planning Council Chair Alex Taft, Bay Village Associates and Orient Height Improvement Organization.

We propose a series of alternatives, the major ones of which are the following:

- Improvement of the Central Artery in Boston traffic congestion occures because too many vehicles are using an inadequate and poorly designed highway system as the main north-south artary. The Central Artery should be recognized as the prime cause of the traffic congestion, and not the tunnels. There are numerous

mergers on the Artery, like the bottleneck where Mystic Bridge traffic merges with I-93 traffic, which prevents traffic from moving smoothly, and limit full capacity of the bridge and tunnels. Back-ups into the Sumner Tunnel, vehicles are forced to stop for pedestrians and delivery trucks crossing tunnel traffic to get to and from the North End. Cars and trucks parked and double-parked at the North End businesses in the area further stall traffic. Exit ramps that were separated from local traffic and a pedestrian crosswalk would not only make a traffic flow more easily, but would also greatly increase safety. The Artery traffic has reached a level where it can no longer be integrated with local streets safely or efficiently. The Artery demands immediate attention and extensive improvements.

- Our second recommendation of an alternative, permanent one-one tolls, about 10,000 vehicles pass through the Callahan Tunnel each day during rush hours. About 40 percent of these vehicles are headed for the airport. The Joint Mass. Port Authority/Mass. Turnpike Authority one-way toll experiment at the tunnels and the bridge conceived of in the early 1970's, but tested only in 1983, has cut minutes of the travel time to the air-

port, and has made the north-south commute much less painful. Permanent one-way tolls have been extremely successful in many other major cities: California, New York and New Jersey have all instituted one-way tolls on their tunnel and bridge networks and have seen significant improvements in traffic flow and management. The State should make the Boston one-way toll experiment permanent immediately.

- Another alternative is improved public transportation. Public transit improvements must make it easier for travelers with luggage to move to and from Logan Airport. A Blue Line spur into the airport is one obvious solution that would eliminate the existing transfer from train to bus and the waiting and luggage-lugging that come with it. Trains running on the spur could have cars equipped with specially-designed luggage carriers, and could run express from downtown locations. Only 6 percent of Logan travelers now get to and from the airport on the Blue Line and the airport bus. This figure might be boosted substantially with better access to the airport tailored to the needs of travelers using the line. The tremendous advantages of having a direct low-cost shuttle from Boston to the airport would far outweigh the relatively low con-

struction cost of building a spur to a functioning line, and would eliminate the need for the Mass. Port bus. Connecting the Red Line to the Blue Line at Charles Street and expanding the Blue Line north to Lynn would also make it easier for passengers to the west, north and south of Boston to get to the airport.

- The State should also expand satellite parking areas near major highways like 93, 95, 495 and 1 and provide frequent express shuttle bus and limousine service to downtown Boston and the airport. This solution would help solve both a traffic problem and a parking problem in the Boston area. If the State actively publicizes the lots, encourages their use, and clearly marks them on the highways, many more commuters will know about them and use them. Special airport shuttles could accommodate luggage. The success of satellite lots in cities as nearby as Hartford, Connecticut proves that people will keep their cars out of a congested city if there are incentives.
- Our last alternative to the Third Harbor Tunnel I will say is a major one is to introduce and implement an extensive ferry network while the City's waterfront development is accelerating, the tremendous public transportation possibilities of the harbor remain un-

tapped. Several private waterfront developers have realized that the shortest distance between Boston and the airport is by water, and have included ferry docks in their plans for the future. Mass. Port and the State could encourage ferry service by linking the $134,000,000 Bird Island Flats development at the airport with Mass. Port's $125,000,000 project at Commonwealth Pier by water. Ferries could easily handle the projected hundreds of thousands of yearly visitors and would add a distinctive, functional dimension to the accessibility of both projects.

- Shuttle ferries to the airport could be only a single component in an extensive harbor ferry network to accommodate commuters from the north and south, workers at the shipyards and piers, and pleasure travelers headed for the harbor islands. Docks at Charlestown, the North End, South Boston, East Boston would fill out the network and link Boston's waterfront neighborhoods. The successful South Shore ferry system should also be expanded.
- Special buses could link the ferry system with existing M.B.T.A. lines and the airport. Express buses with luggage carriers could take travelers from North and South Stations and central M.B.T.A. stops

directly to these ferries headed for the airport. An extensive public ferry network linked to existing and expanded public transit lines would be a serious creative solution to some of Boston's transportation problems.

The East Boston Community and all of the groups that I listed earlier in the coalition statement have been very active in pursuing alternative transportation. We had a dream for a long time and the dream is to make this City a better city to live in and to work. So we ascribed very strongly to the words that were written by a poet which said, "Hold fast your dreams for if dreams die life is but a broken wing of a bird that cannot fly."

I also would like to say that the statement from the members of the coalition are very low-keyed tonight and they are meant to be instructive offering creative solutions from a very bad traffic problem. Why we are very calm and we are very deliberative in our statement and have done a of the research on this whole issue, we want the State officials and the Federal officials who hear and who will read our report not just to listen to words that we recite here tonight which are very calm and cool and it is done deliberately, we also want you to listen to the undertone that is here.

We are speaking with a passion here tonight and the underlying one, the undertone to our very creative businesslike approach and we will not let our comments and solutions end here or end with the City's process of the final E.I.R. We intend to pursue our solutions to the traffic problems of Boston beyond tonight's meeting and the final E.I.R. Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: The next speaker will be Mr. Ray Flynn who is tha Boston City Counselor and candidate for mayor.

RAY FLYNN: One of my concerns about the so-called Third Harbor Tunnel it seems like I have spent most of my time in Boston legislature and City government fighting for concerns for people in East Boston and South Boston. Ironically we are here once again. Let me say that I think that it is really a salacious argument to state that we have these federal transportation moneys so, therefore, we should take advantage of them to build this third harbor crossing all across the city. I for those of us who are aware of the notice know the deteriorating bridges and roads, our public transportation system, M.B.T.A., is in the state of chaos. We know that people are not taking the public transportation into the City of Boston.

For me to get into City Hall from my home

I have to go through densely residential areas because of all of the bridges providing direct access to City Hall are not in operation and again the argument that this money is available, therefore, we should advantage of it.

In my opinion it's really shortsighted. I think from a transportation point of view we have not adequately addressed the issues, the transportation of smooth flow of traffic out of the City. I do not really clearly understand how we can possibly say the impact on the communities affected will be minimal and at the same time we are seeing a fight in East Boston over the construction of a huge airport or huge hotel in a densely residential community. We are seeing efforts of communities being frustrated because of the inability of the government to provide a parking freeze on the number of parking spaces in East Boston and we are also seeing, because of the traffic congestion, people refusing to flock traffic or reroute traffic so that it does not impact the East Boston community.

My impression, and it's my concern here that this would be shortsighted, it would not really provide the kind of relief that transportation are talking about. I have read the Environmental Impact Statement, 300 page Impact Statement and I do not see how it is going to -- how it is not going to cause a severe impact on the East Boston com-

munity. We are very much in favor of alleviating traffic, we are very much in favor of alleviating the congestion through the streets of South Boston and East Boston and the Southeast Expressway but what I think we ought to do, we ought to improve the bridges and improve the roads that are impassable at this particular time and provide moneys for improved and safety on scheduled transportation systems.

I think depressing of the Central Artery, of course, is long overdue and that Artery is in horrendous condition.

The Third Harbor Tunnel in my opinion would not provide the kind of relief that some of the planners are talking about so I want to join in this coalition once again and I'm disappointed that there are not more people here to express this opposition because of the hearings that you had on this, there have been significant opposition to it and I went to understand, the people of East Boston and the people of South Boston are making it very clear under the so-called guise of the province we are not going to compromise our safety and stability of our neighborhood. Thank you very much.

MARIE CARGILL: I would like to introduce the next speaker as Mel King, former Representative and also candidate for mayor.

MEL KING: Thank you for the record,

Mr. Tierney and members of the commission. As I believe the concerns that they raise fundamentally were correct and they needed to be helped to. They offer alternatives to this committee to take a look at, they have expressed some concerns about the problems that they will be facing and I come to support them but also to raise some additional questions for consideration. The majority issue as I see it has to do with the question of the airport, whether or not there is any kind of growth policy. It seems to me that it is for us to continue on a global approach which seems to be the policy that exists gobbled up in line and gobbled up homes and it makes it impossible for people to live and just require more and more byways of transportation for access to it.

It is not clear to me whether or not there has been any regional approach to look at the issue of need for either the depression of the Artery or the Third Harbor Crossing. When I raise that question in the light of time mesning this thing will be completed maybe by the year 2000, then what is the need going to be then in terms of whether or not people are going to have the kind of fuel for their automobiles, whether or not the energy shortage is going to be so acute given the kind of trends that there won't be the kind of trains and the number of automobiles that it will be using but I think what is most alarming about it is the level of centrsl-

ization that we see. The centralization on the airport, the centralization in terms of downtown and I find this is frightening and it is interesting that even the rush answer in terms of their economic analysis, the problems that we are facing in this society have understood the importance of decentralizing and I think that is a serious gap in the planning process.

I see it here in the City of Boston and I think it would be important to get some decentralization of thebuildings that are going up downtown. They need to be spread out in ways across the City and I think to do that it would alleviate the need for, as far as I understand it, 50 percent of those cars who come into downtown. I think we talked about Downtown Crossing and we want to expand it. I think we need to say to them if we can get the resources allocated in other parts of the City so that we have balanced it in the City but I think as the State, we need to talk about balanced development.

I think we need to look at what is happening with this, with respect to Springfield, Worcester and whether or not we can do something about the satellite import in other parts of the Commonwealth because we ought to be talking about balanced development across the Commonwealth as well.

This reminds me of the time poverty, there

was a lot of community agencies and that is when the Federal Government said we have this kind of funds available for you then you have to change what you are doing, then the community agencies, in order to get that money will do what the Federal Government says. It seems to me that is what is happening here. That there has always been a commitment and maybe I should not always say always there has been that commitment on the part of people in the Dukakis administration in which he also did not went to go for this Third Harbor Tunnel but it seems to me they have been forced to tie in the resources for the depressed Artery with the Third Harbor Tunnel and that is something that I understand is not coming out of this administration as a direction but it is coming from those people who have the kind of influence with the Federal Government, it seems to me we ought to just say no to that kind of an approach where somebody is saying we ought to plan in the direction that we know is not in the best interest of us so that we can get the dollars to do it.

It seems to me we ought to stand up to the Department of Transportation and say if it is important to do one we do it. I'm not sure it is important to do either of them because I think it is going to have a very drastic impact on the North End community and I think that the fact is that this undergoing change right now will accelerate and it will

be a change that will not meet the kind of community that we know of, a healthy community providing rich heritage and it seems to me that what we miss in this society and in this culture is the importance of continuity and with the approach that I see here we are about to destroy culture and continuity.

Development has to be seen in human terms, what does it mean to the people and if the road does not affect the growth of the people, if it does not make for the building of a community, if it disrupts and destroys communities then it is not development and it is destruction and it is the same as if we had a bomb that was dropped on these people if we do this kind of thing.

So I think in development in human terms and not in bringing in water and steel kinds of materials, we need growth in the community and building of people and not in building of steel and concrete which will destroy the people and the very reason that it is supposed to be developed on that basis. I would say let's not build that. Let us look through alternatives that have been adequately expressed and look at regional development approach and decentralize economically because that is the only way we can have a balanced growth that we need. Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: The coalition, since its

inception, has tried to keep the lines of communication open to both the State and City officials involved in the study and also to the technicians involved in the joint venture proposal. It is in this spirit of cooperation and with a serious desire to convince those officials and technicians with these ideas and comments we thoroughly believe to be the best solution for the City and State transportation problems. We have prepared the following presentation. We will submit these comments by oral comments but we will also fulfill written obligations later on in the month. We have divided our comments in a series of ways both by alignment for the tunnel and by categories for the generic comments as it relates to all of the study and not to specific alternatives or alignments. Our first speaker on comment will be Robert Edding who is the vice president of Jeffries Point Harborside Neighborhood Association.

ROBERT EDDING: Thank you and good evening. It is my privilege to present a general comment on behalf of the coalition against the Third Harbor Tunnel alignment from East Boston (Airport, Jeffries Cove or Conrail) would be a stimulus for airport growth. This growth would cause further encroachment of airport-related industries into the East Boston community. The additional traffic generated by another tunnel would also have an adverse impact on our neighborhood streets

which are already overloaded with airport-related vehicles: i.e., airfreight trucks, car rentals, shuttle vans and buses, taxis and airport customers.

A tunnel connection to C-1 is shifting congestion further north to Bell Circle, Revere. This would make a future connection to Route 95 inevitable.

The tunnel fabrication sight in Lynn as described will adversely impact wetlands affecting mussel flats, fish and water fowl. This should be addressed more seriously and in depth.

Any new tunnel would encourage people to use cars rather than mass transportation. A regional transportation system must be developed towards the use of a balanced system which will not remove uses from mass transit.

What is the content of dredged material? What route will be used to dispose of it? How will it be transported out of the work area? This was not adequately addressed and is a serious environmental issue.

The report is too judgmental, and makes assumptions without adequate data.

Not adequate addressed is water seepage during construction. Our present sewer system is antiquated and is not adequate to accommodate much more.

A concern that was raised and not addressed

was that 10,000 gallons of sanitary sewerage will be disposed of through on-site systems and through public sewerage systems.

Another concern that was raised and not addressed is the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials during construction which include explosives and oil-based materials.

All traffic studies were conducted prior to the implementation of one-way tolls. This needs to be re-studied based on the one-way toll system now in effect.

It was stated that there will be an increase in the T ridership during construction. Can the T carry the additional people? Has this been reviewed and studied?

Expanding mass transit should be considered to determine whether it would provide more permanent jobs than constructions jobs for the immediate area. (Boston and region)

It is stated that there would be displacement of over 3,000 employees due to taking of buildings. Local relocation of these businesses is vital. Any loss of employment in the area is critical. Has relocation been studied?

The cost and amount of energy for lighting

and ventilation are not adequately addressed and this would be a continued burden for the Commonwealth taxpayers.

Where does the excess material from the Artery and tunnel construction go for disposal? It is stated that some will be removed by truck on roads connecting to Route 1-A. This is not adequately addressed. Route 1-A to where? Much more must be included.

If alternative 6 is depressed Central Artery only (no new tunnel), why are provisions being proposed for connections to and from a future third harbor crossing in both the Fort Point Channel area and in the vicinity of South Bay?

Alternative 1, which addresses impacts of redecking of the Central Artery, did not include improvements to the approaches of the existing Callahan/Sumner Tunnels and improvements to Cross Street.

A two-way tunnel to the airport should be fully addressed in the final E.I.S./E.I.R.

There should be an increase in the tolls of the Callahan/Sumner Tunnels to provide for a free annual sticker program for East Boston residents. There should be sale of tokens rather than tickets to motorists to relieve toll booth congestion. This should be investigated to determine the effect on traffic.

Give M.B.T.A. users to Logan Airport incentives for using mass transportation (trains and buses designed for baggage and passengers in mind). Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: The next speaker will be a representative of East Boston Fair Share and will be addressing alternatives.

EAST BOSTON REPRESENTATIVE OF FAIR SHARE: It is our understanding that alternatives to and for are rejected and that further evaluation of a railroad alignment for a tunnel is not warranted. Since they are carried forward in the E.I.R., we feel it is necessary to list some brief comments:

- A railroad alignment would split our community in two.
- It would be inevitable to use our neighborhoods for additional airport use. The businesses that would be forced to vacate due to the construction of the tunnel would need to relocate.
- Potential for changing land use from residential to accommodate dislocated businesses would adversely affect the residential quality of both the Jeffries Point and Mt. Carmel neighborhoods.
- During the construction period that Mt. Carmel area would have minimal access and egress. Mental and physical stress would be placed on residents.

- A proposed staging area on the East Boston piers would have severe impacts on the elderly and handicapped in close proximity: Heritage Apartments, Victory Garden Apartments and Landfall East Apartments. Immigration Building at 72 Marginal Street. This elderly housing was never mentioned in the report.
- The vent emissions would adversely affect these same elderly and handicapped and many other residents with heart and respitory diseases.
- Traffic would be increased on our local streets during construction.
- The potential development of the East Boston piers 1 through 4 would depreciate.
- The potential use of Fort Point Channel would also depreciate.
- Structural impacts to buildings from pils driving not adequately addressed.
- Several local businesses affected negatively.
- There would be a devaluation of property resulting in tax losses to homeowners. Loss of equity and rental income not adequately addressed.
- Visual aesthetics would be destroyed.
- There would be significant environmental impacts not discussed.

- There would be an impact on the access to the East Boston Memorial Stadium during construction and after.
- East Boston's major firehouse on Sumner Street would be working under severe hardship for three to five years.
- No realistic plan is presented for building bridges over the tunnel construction and completed tunnel.
- These alternatives are in the flood plain since the alignment is at sea level.
- The air quality at the E.B. Memorial Stadium would be further degraded.
- The vibration impacts to the M.B.T.A. Red and Blue Lines not adequately addressed.
- This is the most destructive alignment during and after construction to the local area.
- No inventory was presented of the children using the local streets and bridges going to and from neighborhood schools, one parochial school and on Magnet School. These are all elementary schools.
- Water seepage during construction into local antiquated sewers not addressed.
- Short and long-term reduction in the quality of life has not been assessed.

This is part of the coalition statement.

I also have a statement from the East Boston Fair Shers.

Dear Sirs: After reviewing the D.E.I.S./D.E.I.R. and the S.D.E.I.S./S.D.E.I.R we have prepared the following, for your review according to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (M.E.T.A.) E.O.E.A. No. 4325 and hereby submit them for consideration and response.

Our position is also that of the coalition against a third tunnel and we will not at this time reiterate those concerns. However, two issues have come up of late which warrant further investigation. As the administration is lobbying for the support of the business and labor communities, the position has been taken that the Third Harbor Tunnel Interstate 90 project is inseparable from the Central Artery Interstate 93 project. It is our understanding that the Third Harbor Tunnel E.I.S./R faces a September 30 completion deadline. It is also our understanding that the repair or reconstruction of the existing Artery has no timeline and may require further review and study. We would appreciate a clear position from the Federal Highway Administration on the connections between funding for the Central Artery project and the proposed Third Harbor Tunnel. Last item I have in this letter is that we will submit is that these hearings are being held in Faneuil Hall and there are no handicapped accessability. We fell that is an outrage. There are plenty of

people who would come here tonight who are not able to walk up the stairs and I think and there are people outside that feel that way also.

The discriminations are a large number. People that use public transportation and would use it if it were in better condition and having a third tunnel would not allow the moneys used to better the M.B.T.A.

I'm not really staying on this I'm going off this but I don't care. In this Globe report (indicating) it states, "East Boston opponents to earlier tunnel proposals have been largely won over by several factors: The tunnel as now envisioned will emerge at the airport rather than in the midst of a neighborhood. Recreational facilities will actually be slightly enlarged and adjustments in Logan air traffic will be subject to improved sound buffering." The writer, the editor of this article had better waks up. Even though we may be a handful tonight we know it is hot. We are tired. We don't want the tunnel in this package deal and it is ridiculous and we are in number so the editorial Globe wake up.

MARIE CARGILL: Alternative 3, 5 and 3-A will be commented upon by Mr. Robert Dimingo.

ROBERT DIMINGO: First of all I would like to discuss alternative 3 which is Third Harbor Tunnel from

Fort Point and alternative 5, Channel to Jeffries Cove/Airport Alignment and alternative 3-A, Central Artery depression with Third Harbor Tunnel via Fort Point Channel.

During the construction of Jeffries Cove Alignment, Porzio Park, Jeffries Yacht Club and Jeffries Cove, in general, will be adversely impacted. The Yacht Club will be idle for too long in all likelihood forcing it to go out of business. This is the oldest chartered yacht club on the East Coast. The construction of the proposed Bird Island Flats Park would probably be delayed or hindered in its development. If developed, access from the neighborhood will be discontinued during the construction period of three to five years.

East Boston Memorial Stadium, protected by Section 4 (F), will be disseminated by the construction period and some land would be taken. The stadium land was transferred to the City of Boston, Parks and Recreation Department, in 1954 by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in exchange for two city-owned recreational facilities, World War Memorial Park (65 acree - taken from a runway) and Amerena Playground (taken for airport postal operations). This was required for airport expansion. The stadium represents more than 50 percent of East Boston's recreational facilities. Some of the activities at the stadium are: track, tennis, football, baseball, basketball, Tot Lot. Uses of the

stadium include: mentally retarded groups, New England Soccer Team, T ball teams, Little League and Minor League baseball teams, Revere Lancers, APAC Day Camp and for general recreation. What accommodations will be made to accommodate the uses and the users?

Following construction the users of the stadium will be exposed to an increase in impacts on the ambient environment already heavily impacted from the enumerable transportation facilities encircling the stadium. Has the air quality been addressed adequately at this location?

The vent structure proposed at the end of Maverick Street has serious negative environmental impacts especially on the elderly and the residential community.

The toll plaza, adjacent to the vent structure, generates and concentrates pollutants creating another hotspot.

The new traffic from a four-lane tunnel emptying into the airport roadway hasn't been adequately addressed. It cannot die on the airport and will inevitably lead to additional road construction to tie into C-1.

Fort Point Channel would be adversely impacted by a tunnel alignment. There would be severe physical impacts on the Channel. While other cities in the world are creating man-made channels, we are destroying a natural beauty.

In many areas there may be structural damage to property during construction. How will this be addressed in the final E.I.R./E.I.S.? How much money will be set aside to compensate for these damages? How will damage be assessed?

The impact on Gillette Company could be significant due to construction vibration and water use.

The M.B.T.A. is not adequately addressed under these alternatives. No allowance is made for an extension of the Blue Line to the airport terminals or access during construction.

How will the Blue Line be affected during construction?

Not adequately addressed were the impacts on the water quality of Jeffries Cove during and following construction. Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: I will state alternative 5-A. It is stated that there will be an additional 17,000 cross-harbor trips per day but traffic impacts in East Boston not discussed.

Toll increase is inevitable. It is stated that tolls may be subsidized by the State. It's not realistic to believe that the State will subsidize the motorists.

By implementing a higher toll for the Third

harbor crossing, traffic will continue on to the Callahan/Sumner Tunnels.

If there is a decrease in the use of the Callahan/Sumner Tunnels, there would be a loss in revenue to the existing tunnels, which are bonded.

Following construction of a third harbor crossing, it is stated that there will be a loss of T ridership and a loss of Mystic Tobin Bridge users. The foregone conclusion is that we are enticing people to use private cars rather than public transportation.

Alternative 5-A: Design modification.

The summary of significant environmental impacts chart does not have this alternative listed.

Data not covered: Air quality, noise and vibration, traffic impact, water resources, land use and economic impacts, dredge material disposal, historic resources report, public participation, archeological survey report.

When will these be addressed? In what form will they be?

The temporary relocation of Eastern Airlines satellite gate facilities during the construction phasing must be addressed in the F.E.I.S./F.E.I.R.

Will a separate study be required to access

the impacts? Will temporary become permanent?

This alternative may be impossible to construct due to the following reasons?

- A four and a half year construction period from water's edge to the terminal.
- High dust accumulation on aircraft engines. The lives of the flying public would be at stake because of probable engine malfunction or dust on critical control surfaces and equipment.
- Working hours would be severely curtailed due to safety issues.
- What process will be used to control dust?
- Will harmful substances be used in the process?

The negative impacts on the proposed development of the Massachusetts Technology Center on Bird Island Flats must be fully addressed and mitigated.

Is this a new alternative or another alignment within an alternative?

Traffic analysis indicates that through at least 2010 there is no need for more than one lane in each direction yet a four-lane is the preferred design. Four lanes invites diverted traffic and induces more traffic over the long run.

Present design calls for direct access on

the East Boston side to Route 1-A. This traffic diversion from Tobin Bridge to tunnels is undesirable for residents of this traffic corridor. Moreover, Route 1-A is inadequate in design to handle local traffic, present tunnel traffic, and a third tunnel's traffic. The inevitable is massive congestion on Route 1-A in East Boston and Revere. The undesirable and unacceptable consequences seem to be the changing of Route 1-A to Interstate design.

At present, East Boston suffers from three very harmful impacts of Logan Airport and the existing tunnels:

- Airport traffic uses local streets to avoid queues, putting the health and safety of our residents in jeopardy.
- Because of easy access to our neighborhoods, many business - especially parking lots, rent-a-cars and freight forwarders have begun to refrain from locating on Logan and are now in our neighborhood.
- Daily commuters from the northern suburbs also use our local streets in an effort to avoid the queues on Route 1-A.

The study did not include a review of:

- The closure of Porter and Maverick Streets to Logan Airport.
- Relocation of airport-related business onto the

airport.

- The reuse of East Boston land from which those businesses will relocate in a manner which is compatible with and improves our neighborhoods.
- A solution to our Day Square truck traffic problem Route 1-A and Chelsea connectors.
- The elimination of the opportunity for non-East Boston oriented traffic to use East Boston streets.

We see no evidence of analysis of the location of the vent stack. We are unable at this point to determine how damaging the emissions will be.

Especially through the design of hook-ups to 1-A, East Boston Stadium may have four F impacts and certainly will have more traffic circulating around it.

It has been stated that tunnel construction will begin before the depressed Artery construction. This leads to a five-year plus period in which the new and existing tunnels would serve as a displayed Central Artery -- unacceptable. The effects of this construction phase have not been studied.

The next speaker will be Mr. James Casey who is representing the Globe Street Citizens Committee. He will talk on public participation/information concerns on water quality, land use and economic impact and traffic impacts.

JAMES CASEY: Public participation/ information. Considering the scope and potential impact of this project, holding only two working committee meetings since the addition of the new alternative seems too few to address the impacts, concerns and issues.

- Is there a listing of other meetings?
- What other meetings will be held?
- How will updated timely information be disseminated?

The information presented in the supplemental draft E.I.S./E.I.R. is too difficult to understand in order to make rational choices.

The information is too technical for this stage of the process.

The study is not readable in the total package as it has not been adequately coordinated.

There was an inadequate number of copies of the supplement distributed. Some copies were received two weeks prior to their public hearing. Did this provide enough time to adequately review the material? This report is, as you know, two sets of 300 page books as well as seven appendices and four supportive reports.

The technical information is confusing to lay people and some knowledgeable technicians.

I am also going to add at the end of this

public participation section to reiterate that the State Transportation Department is either purposely or by inference perpetrating a fraud on the public that both the Third Harbor Tunnel and the Central Artery, after having a decision by September 30, I would like to read, at least the first paragraph of page 2 of the supplement of draft, the State in fact, the F.H.W.U. has determined that the proposed action is made up of two projects, the Third Harbor Tunnel and the Central Artery. The third projects are sufficiently different roles and independently.

Rather than go through paragraph 2 and 3 I would just state it says in there one is Interstate project that needs to have by September 30 and the other is classified as non-Interstate and at this time there has been no information brought out by the State Department Transportation or the F.H.W.U. that this has to be addressed, not only by September 30 or by any deadline date.

Water quality: The tunnels of the Central Artery, South Boston seaport access road and third harbor crossing shall require cleaning from time to time. How will this cleaning take place as the pollutant particles shall be washed down and conceivably be put into the sewer-drainage system which in time will affect our water quality. The methods of cleaning and disposal of residue should be addressed

in all three tunnel locations.

The new alignments of 5-A and 5-A modified should be tested and confirmed relative to harbor sediment and impact on water quality.

As stated, dredging will take place over two years since 250 working days are required and work will not proceed during flounder spawning season between February 1 and May 15. Are other forms of marine life affected by this two-year operation due to the change in the water quality?

What are comments from fish and wildlife service on the 5-A modified alternative?

Land use-economic: This aspect has not been studied in depth.

There must be more business input from the immediate areas of construction.

- There will be approximately 12 years of construction spread over several areas, for what return to the business?
- Who will compensate for their losses during construction?
- There will be potential for development of new developable land. This land could be turned over to the City for tax return uses.
- Some process must be implemented for interested community people to participate in providing input and

in the decision-making process.

Several Section 4 (F) proprieties are impacted:

- Paul Revere Landing Park in the North Station area.
- Charles River Reservation and others.
- Fort Point Channel.
- There will be some permanent takings and some temporary construction easements.
- All possible mitigating measures must be explored to minimize harm. A process must be implemented to allow affected communities to participate in designing the finished product.

Traffic: South End-Herald Street, East Berkeley Street not adequately addressed.

Will parking be replaced in downtown/North End areas during and following construction?

What accommodations will be made for losses of parking spaces during construction? Will shuttle service be implemented?

Is a Storrow Drive connector included in assumptions, i.e., from Mystic-Tobin Bridge to Storrow Drive?

Who approves or prohibits use of tunnels as hazardous cargo vehicle routes? Has application been made for use of these routes?

How will hazardous cargo traffic be handled on local surface streets?

What are the impacts if a third harbor crossing were built after the depression of the Central Artery?

The new Surface Artery has not been adequately addressed, as it will become a new Artery rather than a local street. It is shown as a three and four-lane roadway in each direction, which is not a local street. Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: The next speaker will be Lucie Parano who will speak on air quality/ventilation structures.

LUCIE PARANO: Air quality/ventilation structures: Location of vent structures is questionable and must be investigated further.

Cleaning is not adequately addressed. This equipment shall have a concentration of pollutants and will require careful and controlled cleaning. How will this be monitored and by whom?

All measurements of C.O. and No. 2 were taken under ideal design conditions. It is stated that if there is malfunctioning of the ventilation fans there could be a health hazard. Could should be would. The procedures recommended to maintain the vent system must be followed not should be.

How is acceptable defined?

- Is this a Federal guideline? Is acceptable the minimum standard?
- If so, we cannot accept acceptable because then the minimum becomes the maximum.

Visual/aesthetic impacts. The study makes judgments that areas would be knitted together visually. These decisions should be made by the affected communities, the North End - they may feel more protected by the walls.

How do the proposed new level bridges look from the Charlestown and Beacon Hill neighborhoods?

The shadowing effect reduces the aesthetic quality of the pedestrian walkway and the public recreation value of the area.

What is the visual effect across the Charles River?

Not adequately addressed are the adverse impacts of these bridges on the existing and proposed M.O.C. park facilities along the Charles River.

The Fort Point Channel is visually affected by all alternatives and must be addressed.

The vent buildings need serious study before the design stage to investigate alternative forms and/or solutions. Thank you very much.

MARIE CARGILL: Thank you. We will now move into some more comments. These are made by spokespeople who represent area neighborhood groups in East Boston. First is Gina Scalcione who is president of the Citizen Committee.

THE COMMISSIONER: Before you testify I would like to take a one-minute break to find out how many people are signing up because we have to leave here at eleven o'clock tonight. So will you excuse me for a minute.

(Whereupon a short recess was then taken.)

GINA SCALCIONE: My name is Gina Scalcione and I am a member of the Coalition against the Third Harbor Tunnel. I live approximately 1,000 feet from Logan Airport. We have been fighting the tunnel for many years as I see the traffic coming through my neighborhood and my home.

I would like to go into detail. Logan Airport in East Boston, the past couple of days people and elected officials have stated if the tunnel goes through Logan Airport it is not really, in fact, East Boston. Well, I would like to explain a little bit about what East Boston is about. East Boston is never an East Boston. East Boston is Logan Airport. Logan Airport is a good neighbor. Logan Airport also has one-third of the business related in our community. My children live less than three blocks from the school, they

take a private bus every day to go to the school because Logan Airport is related to traffic on my street. You should, you say, Mr. Chairman, you need a third harbor tunnel? Well, Mass. Port does not have a cap. Mass. Port says they are not the City so therefore, they cannot address the airport-related business. They cannot address the people taking the parking, rent-a-car, they spread through our streets and even endanger our lives and break up our streets and we pay for it.

Mass. Port also states that they are not addressing the Logan Airport. They do not have a master plan. They do not have a cap and they are proposing, along with the State administration, a third harbor tunnel, four lanes or less. In return for that they will give us some perking land, that Mass. Port stole from East Boston a few years ago. That is not acceptable. Mass. Port has to be controlled. Mass. Port can no longer grow.

A third harbor tunnel for Mass. Port is a destruction of East Boston. Once and for all I think our elected officials, Department of Public Works, Federal Highway Administration should realize the moneys for transportation should be for us. The people that are contributing and not Mass. Port. They have plenty of money if they need a tunnel to build it themselves and that East Boston will still fight to make sure that Logan Airport does not affect us any longer.

We will fight if it takes forever and my children will fight after me if it takes forever. Logan Airport has to be stopped. A third harbor tunnel is not for East Boston. It is for Logan Airport and people in the suburbs. They want to come to Logan Airport in their limousines at our expense. Enough is enough, and I speak for many thousands of people from the Mt. Carmel and Jeffries Point area. They could not be here tonight because this place is not accessible and because this place is very hot tonight.

MARIE CARGILL: Now Mr. Samuel DePaulo has some comments representing the Boston Typographical Union No. 13.

SAMUEL DePAULO: My name is Samuel DePaulo and I am here representing Boston Typographical Union No. 13. I have a statement which I would like to read before you this evening. The Boston Typographical Union is planning to oppose the construction of a third harbor tunnel. Although our brothers and sisters of the State A.F.L./C.I.O. and the building trades unions have endorsed this project. We must voice our opposition. As union members we must state our solidarity with the community where we live, and those opposed to the proposed tunnel.

Boston needs a solution to the complex regional transportation problem that reaches beyond the needs

of a single purpose tunnel. The transit alternatives to a tunnel would employ more laborers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers and pipe fitters, structural metal workers, tool makers, metal working assemblers and plasterers.

Transit rehabilitation would make the greatest use of resident construction labor force. Improving mass transit should be the highest priority of the Dukakis administration. The availability of employment for many people depends not only on whether there are jobs to be had, but on whether workers can commute to potential work places. The very old and the very young who cannot operate automobiles the very poor who cannot afford them depend on public transit. For others who can choose how they travel, the speed, comfort and convenience of public transit helps them decide how to get to work, where to work and where to spend.

Because of the complexity of underwater tunnel construction, much of the prefabrication of material will be outside of the region, and the labor necessary to assemble/construct it will also be from out-of-State.

Ultimately, the needs for maintenance and repair of roads would require fewer workers than compared to the long-term repair and rehabilitation of public traneit.

For those reasons and those also stated by other members of the coalition against the tunnel. We stand

opposed to the third harbor crossing. Any consideration of a tunnel should review overall long-term economic impacts which have not yet been addressed. This report will be submitted to the Board for adoption.

MARIE CARGILL: The next speaker is Paul Marquis who will represent and address issues pertinent to the East Boston Harborside Community School.

PAUL MARQUIS: I represent the East Boston Harborside Community Council. On behalf of the East Boston Harborside Community School Council I wish to express our opposition to the Third Harbor Tunnel. It is something we cannot tolerate an additional third harbor crossing. The community will be severely impacted in the areas of the public safety and health as a result of the increase of residential and Mass. Port. The study documents do not indicate any precautionary measures or design elements that address this issue. Health again, exhaust will add to the already existing poor air quality, again to guarantee that will not happen in regard to economic welfare the State and Federal Government fail to send any federal dollars on it. A number of depoeits, the alternatives such as improvement in the Central Artery. Improved public transportation, permanent one-way tolls and extensive ferry network.

On the issue of jobs it has been reoorted

that the number of small projects and alternatives will increase the number of jobs and spread the wealth and growth of the Commonwealth finelly. East Boston wae once rich in residential, now we are left with small percentagee of residential houses and recreational areas. Our community cannot take on the burden of a third harbor crossing that will create and that we fear thst the crossing will lead to lessen quality of residential life. Thank you.

MARIE CARGILL: This is the conclueion of the Coalition against the Third Tunnel's report and comments. By 1990 traffic projections indicate an acute time in rush hour delay of 19 minutes between Southampton Street and Charlestown if the present stay is still in effect. A third tunnel drops the wait merely to 18 minutes, seven or three tens of a minute. We aek should the Federel Government through the State invest one billion dollars for three tens of a minute and the livee of every commuter going to or coming from Logan Airport?

In the year 2020, according to other projectione will we see three congeeted tunnels, more traffic on our local streets and more airport encroachment in our neighborhoods? In the 2020 rather will we hear sgain the cry for a fourth tunnel to relieve our transportation problems? We hope the comments voiced here tonight can be responded to

in a satisfactory fashion and we further hope you will improve public particiaation at all levels in State transportation planning so that citizens may play an active role in final transportation decisions which permanently affect the quality of life in the use of public money. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'd like to thank all the members of the Coalition who testified. We would like to take about a ten minute break for the stenographer to rest his fingers and for others who would like to stretch. We have four people I believe who signed up to speak in the next hour and ten or fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon a 15 minute recess was then taken.)

THE COMMISSIONER: Before we go on to the next speaker you should be aware that we will be opeo until eleven o'clock tonight at which time we will recess until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning and the hearing will be concluded at eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

There are no scheduled speakers from now on except for three people who are signed up this evening and the first one is John Kincaid.

JOHN KINCAID: I am John Kincaid and I am a director of sales and services for Eastern Airlines and I would like to read s statement for Eastern Airlines.

Eastern Airlines supports the construction of a Third Harbor tunnel if it will provide improved vehicular access to the airport for the traveling public, and in addition, will reduce traffic congestion on airport roads and on neighborhood streets. Eastern has been serving Logan Airport for a long time. We have developed an excellent facility here and have no desire to see its efficiency eroded.

After attending a number of the working sessions and after reviewing the supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Report we are very concerned with what will happen to our airport facilities if Alternate 5-A Modified is the selected alternative. Three of our facilities are in the direct path of the tunnel. New buildings, at least equal in size and function, must be built on the airport to replace them.

The first of these facilities is our New England reservation center. A new center must be constructed at a site remote from the tunnel. The proposed underpinning of the existing building is unacceptable as the computers and telephone switching equipment cannot be subjected to vibrations caused by construction activity or by traffic passing through a completed tunnel under the building. The associated parking lot of approximately 400 cars must also be relocated.

The second of these facilities is our airfreight building. The freight operations must be relocated temporarily to another building during construction of the tunnel. The present building will be removed. After backfilling of the tunnel, our airfreight buildings can be rebuilt on the same site. The tunnel sections will be designed to support a three to five story structure. We recognize that there is no direct roadway access down on the drawing between the inbound airport road and the new Bird Island Flats road. But we also know that this must be changed before the project is completed, in order to prevent all the Bird Island Flats traffic from circuiting the main airport road system.

The third facility is the underground aircraft fuel tank system. Some of these tanks can be relocated to a remote site leaving several tanks and the pumping system in place. An underground supply pipeline will be required between the two cities to provide a method of trickle feeding the tanks that remain in place.

The operation of these three facilities cannot be interrupted for a single minute. The temporary and permanent buildings replacing these facilities must be built completely furnished and upgraded before we will move out of the existing facilities. In all cases, the duplication of equipment will be required as moving will be phased over one

or two nights. This includes duplication of the computer and telephone switching equipment in the reservation center.

In addition to the extensive work and relocations required for these three facilities, we are also concerned about our terminal and hangar operations during the construction period. The temporary concourses must be built in order to maintain normal flight schedules. One concourse will be used by commuters who will be displaced by the construction of the second temporary concourse, to be used by the air shuttle aircraft. Both concourses will extend from the back of the terminal towards the south. Shuttle operations will be temporarily relocated to the second concourse. The temporary commuter concourse will demolished and the commuters will be relocated to the present shuttle satellite. Both air shuttle and commuters will be returned to their original locations after the tunnel is completed.

The interchange of shuttle and the commuter aircraft is required to allow the hangar to operate 24 hours a day. The smaller commuter aircraft parked around the shuttle satellite will allow L-1011 access to both sides of the hangar.

We are also concerned with debris, dirt, and dust, from construction work so close to operating aircraft. Duet can cause serious damage when ingested by jet

engines. It will be necessary to take every precaution known to the construction industry to prevent this.

Finally, we understand that the cost of all relocations, phased construction, temporary buildings, special equipment and moving expenses will be a part of the overall budget and integral part of the project. Eastern Airlines will not pay for any activities caused by the construction of the tunnel.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. The next speaker will be Cervan Towfig.

CERVAN TOWFIG: I am from 51 Concord Avenue, Medford . I am here as an engineer and concerned citizen. There is a sixth alternative to everything that has been said here as far as the engineering of the airport is concerned and that is the use of the Tobin Bridge. Right now it is possible to go from the airport via to the Tobin Bridge except we have to go through some business district areas and that are suited for high-speed traffic. However, at the intersection of the southbound Iron Street and Route 1 there is always a traffic congestion, especially in the morning which is absolutely sometimes goes back for a mile on Route 93. If an access were made to go to the airport by via the Tobin Bridge that it is conceivable that one third of all of the southbound traffic on I-93 would be directed to go to the air-

port directly. The road is not that much longer and the fact is that on the way back you also bypass all of the tunnels and all of the northbound cars and traffic can take the route to the Tobin Bridge and off 93 to eliminate that problem.

I don't know why this has never been suggested. The route has been used by many commuters including myself for years and years and it can be very quick and it can be very easy to get to the airport that way. The road is laid out. You don't need a billion dollars to make it, just a million dollars would clean up what is available right now and make an extra access to the airport which we don't have now. Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for coming. I think we exhausted our list for people who want to speak so we will take a rest until someone does want to speak.

(Whereupon a short recess was then taken.)

THE COMMISSIONER: Robert

ROBERT DiCARA : I am a candidate for District One Boston City Council. Therefore, it is incumbent upon me as a concerned citizen and particularly a concerned candidate to come here and voice my opinion for not only my personal feelings but the community of East Boston, North End and I'm sure that will be some serious impact on

Charlestown.

I would be neglecting my duties although not as an elected official but a prospective elected official not to be here tonight.

If I may, a nebulous position to date, because I feel that there is a period from what I understand of three years of planning to do a combination of a Central Artery and a Third Harbor Tunnel and, therefore, the Tobin. The picture becomes more clear to myself and to the citizens of these communities that I am not going to take a hard and fast position but I do have, at this point, an idea of where I want to go as a person that would be representing the people of, again East Boston and North End and Charlestown.

What I would advocate would be to try to say to the East Bostonians and the North End, if they make a decision to allow a Third Harbor Tunnel to be built and a Central Artery to be built, I would feel that certain parts of this project should be constructed to appease them.

Therefore, I have my own concept of how the Central Artery and the Third Harbor Tunnel should be constructed. The Third Harbot Tunnel in my opinion if built should be absolutely surface on the Mass. Port Authority, more specifically, the area called Bird Island Flats. I would also like, within the time frame of three years of

planning of a bottom line that the Third Herbor Tunnel will have something similer, if I may, a gigantic cul-de-sac that will allow people to come from other parts west, and south of Boston that do not live in this community of East Boston to drop off, pick up passengers at Logan Airport and, if they wish, to take an airplane trip themselves and park their automobiles within the vicinity of the airport.

From what I understand the study indicates that there are 53 percent of the automobile traffic that go through the Callahan Tunnel is airport related, therefore, the Callahan Tunnel and the streets of my hometown of East Boston will have a reduction of automobile traffic coming from West and South Boston and then return from the Sumner Tunnel and then the South would decresse over 50 percent and therefore, alleviate some of the traffic that is now too wrapped up.

The people from the North End part of Boston in order not to get in a traffic jam use our community streets. I feel if we have this type of tunnel built that the people from the northern part of Massachusetts that come down to use the tunnel would stay on Route C-1. Therefore, East Boston would have less traffic and yet the commuters from south and west of the city would be able to get to the airport more quick. As far as the Central Artery, that is

like the Third Harbor Tunnel, a multi-billion dollar project. The Third Harbor Tunnel approximately one billion dollars. From what I understand the central harbor being 2.1 billion dollars, again I believe that the citizens of the North End deserve some kind of thank you and once again I reiterate what I said at past public meetings, although not official public hearings as this one, that I would like to see communities have an opportunity to have serious input on the topside if I may call it that, development of the tunnel. If the Central Artery is depressed and becomes a tunnel, the topside development I believe should include to say thank you to the North End people.

Subsidized housing I believe should include multi-layer parking so the North End residents and North End businessee will be able to have an automobile to park if they live there and the businesses will be able to have customers that will have a place to park so that they can continue in their livelihoods of more than likely, restaurants and that kind of thing.

Thirdly, during my campaign I have found out that the youthshave no gymnasium facilities and I would like to see also to include in the topside development a gymnasium for the youths in the North End. I would also like to see on that topside development open space area with

greenery for the senior citizens to enjoy in the better months of the year to sit out on the park benches.

Finally I have been requested by the Cultural Organization of the North End to speak on their behalf in terms of possibly getting a cultural center built, some kind of theatre or whatever. I feel that again, two billion, one hundred billion dollars is a lot, an awful lot of money and that since I do real estate developing myself, I feel an additional 20 or 40 million dollars to do this type of development is feasible. I don't feel that although the Department of Transportation cannot fund topside development it will and that I received requesting my attendance at the meeting tonight from the Secretary of Transportation indicates that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts does want input from the Community regarding topside development.

Therefore, I would assume he is telling us that there will be moneys available from some source if not the Department of Transportation. My experience tells me that the Department of HUD, Housing, Urban Development, is possibly a source for money.

The Department of Commerce under which has the E.E.I.C. programs for water and sewerage lines is possibly a source. I believe that the Governor of Massachusetts has under the present community plot grants given to various aids

including Massachusetts and these funds are to be divided up by the Chief Executive Officer and that, although people are led to believe there is no more Section 8, that is true in terms of money coming from Washington.

However, our Governor could allocate subsidy money for rents, mortgage under the F.H.A. program or whatever program he would like, he could call it Section 1000 or whatever number he wants. It does not matter to me as long as he would be nice enough to subsidize the rents. The reason why people would like subsidized rents, the condominium conversion in the North End is very high and the families going way back in generation after generation can no longer afford to live in the North End. They cannot afford rents and they cannot afford to buy a condominium. They love their neighborhood and they don't want to be pushed out of their neighborhood and it is my job to help these people and one of the ways I can do it is try to get them housing built and with subsidized rents. I want to be able to work with the administration. I think both projects, if the communities of East Boston and the North End get together and get something in return rather than just have the type of method of just building something with no regard for the people in the area. That is just not the way it is done in 1980.

Myself, hopefully as assistant counselor,

I could not sit back and watch that type of activity take place. I want to be a friend to the community. I want to be a friend to this administration and again we all know the art of politics, to communicate and compromise and I would hope that I will be able to reason with this administration and reason with the community that I represent so that everyone will be satisfied to the best of our abilities if I may in the real world but I feel that I will be the local representative and will be put directly on the spot and I want, I would be more than happy to be the person that will be the liaison to try to help the community and help this administration do this project and yet not hurt it. Thank you very much.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We will have another recess.

(Whereupon a short recess was then taken.)

THE COMMISSIONER: This hearing is adjourned effective 10:00 p.m., August 8th, 1983 and will reconvene at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 9th, 1983.

(Whereupon the hearing was then suspended.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Raymond Goudreau, hereby certify that the foregoing 98 pages are a true and accurate transcript according to my stenographic notes taken on Monday, August 8, 1983, at the Public Hearing, Faneuil Hall, Boston, to the best of my skill, knowledge and ability.

COURT REPORTER

VOLUME IV
PAGES 4-1 to 4-119
EXHIBITS --

VOLUME 4

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

PUBLIC HEARING RE:

THIRD HARBOR TUNNEL,
INTERSTATE 90/CENTRAL ARTERY,
INTERSTATE 93

Chairman: Robert T. Tierney,
Commissioner

Also Present: Robert J. McDonagh,
Chief Engineer

Date: Tuesday, August 10, 198

Location: Faneuil Hall
Boston
Massachusetts

Time: 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

INDEX

Speakers:	Page
Mr. Marvin E. Miller	4-21
Commissioner William Geary	4-25
Secretary Thomas Charles Barry	4-32
Mr. Joseph Rubino	4-34
Mr. John Larkin Thompson	4-36
Ms. Kathy Simon	4-39
Mr. Louis Russo	4-42
Mr. Joseph Mullaney	4-43
Dr. Poulos	4-49
Secretary Evelyn Murphy	4-52
Ms. Elizabeth A. Bransfield	4-56
Mr. John D. Crosier	4-60
Mr. Richard D'Ellorfano	4-63
Mr. Maurice E. Simonean	4-65
Mr. Thomas Hogan	4-66
Ms. Carol Sanduck	4-69
Ms. Betsy Johnson	4-74
Mr. Edward Pendergast	4-80
Ms. Kristin Demong	4-82
Mr. Eric Swider	4-85
Ms. Marie Marshall	4-90
Mr. David Porcaro	4-92

PENGAD CO. BAYONNE, N.J. 07002 - FORM E 448

Speakers:	Page
Mr. Robert M. Weinberg	4-96
Mr. Richard C. Pierce	4-98
Mr. John T. Driscoll	4-100
Mr. George Vasquez	4-103
Ms. Joanne Hutherington	4-108
Mr. Michael Taylor	4-111

* * *

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I have your attention, please?

We are about to reopen Day 2 of the Department of Public Works hearings for the Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel crossing, so those of you who are interested in the introductory remarks, please come in and sit down.

My name is Robert Tierney, I'm the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. We will repeat a brief presentation we made yesterday morning which explains in fairly general terms where the Department of Public Works is in the process of advancing improvements to the Artery or the Third Harbor Tunnel. We will give a brief description of the alternative designs and alignments we have studied and we will give you people the ground rules on presenting testimony.

First of all, the Department of Public Works has to at least have held five informal public neighborhood meetings in East Boston, the North End, South End, South Boston and the waterfront. At those meetings which were as informal as such

meetings can get, there was considerable give and take on the various effects studied on the effected neighborhoods. This is a formal public hearing in the sense that everybody who testifies is required to identify himself or herself, we are keeping a verbatim record of all the testimony we are required to present it to the Federal Highway Administration, the minutes of these meetings, held yesterday and today, and we are also required to respond in our final environmental impact statement, which is the document that was produced from these meetings, we are required to respond to questions or comments that are made here in that final environmental impact document.

As far as the timetable involved in the process we are now under way with, both the Central Artery depression and widening and the new third harbor crossing are interstate projects and in our opinion, we are required to submit to the Federal Highway Administration by September 30th a document called a final environmental impact statement, which is Massachusetts recommended, the State of Massachusetts' decision on what improvements, if

any, are to be done to the Artery and what is to be done with regard to the third harbor crossing.

People who do not want to testify in person but want their voices heard may submit written testimony to the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston, and assuming your remarks are received within two weeks, by August 22nd, they will be made a part of the public hearing documents just as much as if you testified here today.

In the back of the room there are a number of handouts which go fairly well into explaining the alternates that have been discussed, the alternates that have been studied, and also the documents which allow you to prepare written comments and tell you what the ground rules are for the public hearing.

The subject of this meeting, of course, is the draft environmental impact statement for the Artery and Tunnel. The draft statement is a series of documents very complicated in some way. And, with me at the head table is Matthew Coogan, Undersecretary of Transportation for the Commonwealth. Mr. Coogan will explain with a

broad brush the alternate means for the Artery and Tunnel that have been studied. Mr. Coogan?

MR. COOGAN: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

It is my job to explain to you the alternatives now under consideration. I will summarize the alternatives in terms of the decision that our government will have to make by the end of this month or the first week in September.

The environmental and supplemental draft environmental impact statement we are here to discuss today essentially gives the number six options, the first option is usually called the "no build" or do nothing alternative. And, then are five "build" alternatives. However, we wish to explain as carefully as we can that option 1, usually known as the "no build" option in which we do not depress the Central Artery and do not build a Third Harbor Tunnel. There really is no such thing as a do nothing alternative.

Option 1 is what we are calling the redecking alternative. The bridge decks on the Central Artery are old and must be replaced, just like bridges are being replaced all around the United States at this point. The bridge decks of

the Mystic River Bridge were replaced in the last four or five years, the bridge decks along the Southeast Expressway will be replaced starting in the next construction season over the next two years. What we are trying to explain is that this is a very common experience that highways do become too old and have to be fixed, and this is given either way. A construction process will have to take place lasting approximately three years, during those three years one lane at a time would be taken out of service for the redecking process. In some cases it would be possible to maintain six lanes of, six modified and temporary lanes of traffic during this process. In other physical situations such as the critical bridge over the Charles River, it will be physically impossible to keep six lanes of Central Artery traffic in service throughout this construction.

This is a very critical fact to understand as we prepare redecking options with its three lanes, with its three years of traffic problems along the Central Artery, with the options we will be explaining later this morning which

involves the depression of the Central Artery. And, in the scene that our engineers have worked out for depressing the Central Artery, it is critical to understand that all six lanes of the Central Artery will be kept in operation throughout the construction period. That is a critical difference between the redecking option and full Artery depression, widening, reconstruction option. So, alternative one, which is sometimes for environmental purposes, is called a "no build" option, is really a redecking option. It costs about $30 million and takes about three years and has some significant traffic impacts along the Central Artery.

Leaving aside the option of, or going beyond the option of not building a new depressed highway or not building a harbor tunnel, the governor will decide to build a tunnel alone, based on the documentation in this book, or he could go to one of the full build options.

Why don't we review the nature of the options at this point starting at the Artery only option.

The Artery only option is discussed in the book and presented in some detail, excuse our

graphics, right there [indicating]. We will show it to anybody who wants to deal with it.

The Artery only option essentially is a decision by the governor, would be a decision by the governor not to build a Third Harbor Tunnel, but to concentrate efforts on the reconstruction of the Central Artery. Let's summarize the important characteristics of an Artery only option.

The present six-lane elevated Central Artery which goes from the Charles River, Causeway Street, to the north, down to the depressed entrance of the existing Dewey Square Tunnel in the general area of High Street and Congress Street. The existing six-lane elevated facility would be taken down and replaced with a new facility with eight lanes of movement, which physical cross-section and motion of its operation would actually be ten lanes. Ten lanes of depressed Artery would be built from Causeway Street to Congress Street. At the present time the Dewey Square Tunnel which operates from Congress Street to Kneeland Street through the South Station area has the capacity for six lanes

of highway traffic. Because it is the policy commitment of this concept to increase through highway capacity to at least eight lanes, and which sometimes takes the configuration of ten lanes because it is our policy commitment to provide at least eight lanes of through traffic, the Central Artery project would propose building a new four-lane tunnel facility from a departure point back at East Berkeley Street by the old Boston Herald-Traveler printing facility, going underground through the South Station railroad yard, through the CONRAIL WYE connector, following the westernmost edge of the Fort Point Channel, going underneath Northern Avenue, Northern Avenue Bridge, coming back into the main trunk at roughly the Harbor Towers' garage, Rowes Wharf Development Center.

So, the new facility would have four lanes northbound along the westernmost end of the Fort Point Channel and six lanes southbound through the existing Dewey Square Tunnel.

The project would be built by a method of, as I just made reference to, in which the existing Central Artery would be kept in operation and, in

effect, a tunnel, an eight to ten-lane tunnel would be built beneath it so the existing facility stays in operation throughout the construction period.

In terms of dollars, the option 6, the Central Artery only, is if we did it without benefit of any other project, about $1.3 million, which, when it is done in combination with other projects, it is considerably less than that because they share common facilities. That is a brief description of the option the governor would have to build an Artery only and no tunnel for it.

Next in the book there are two alternative ways to build the tunnel. They are summarized, I don't know if you can see it, but they are summarized in this piece of graphics here [indicating]. The two alternatives to building a tunnel only are called option 3 and option 5.

It is the characteristic of option 3, option 3 has the so-called center lane where northbound traffic would take this new tunnel at the Fort Point Channel and depart from this point, and southbound traffic would use the existing Dewey

Square Tunnel. In option 3 we call this the split alignment.

In option 3 the split alignment from the Dewey Square area would be matched with the tunn taking a rather S-shape and going into the Jeffries Cove area, coming up roughly on the eit of the Eastern Air Freight Terminal.

In options 3 and option 5 there would be a toll plaza here on the airport land, and it is operating in a two-way toll system in option 3 and option 5.

Going back to describe option 5 now. Option 5 is where a tunnel is built with two-way traffi through the Fort Point Channel and no interconnection with the Central Artery. So, in option a two-way tunnel goes under the Fort Point Channel, takes the same S-shaped curve, goes int the Jeffries Cove alignment, and again comes up on Logan Airport property. That alignment is called option 5.

Looking now at the two alternatives the governor would have if he chose the full build plan, these two alternatives are labeled option 3A and option 5A. We will then discuss somethin

called the design modification, which is a further development in the development of option Figure 5A.

Describing it very briefly, option 3A, it is the old option 3 tunnel with the split alignment married to a depressed Central Artery. So, at this point there would be a area over where airport bound traffic goes this way, and Central Artery, there's a crossway there, let's put it that way.

In option 3A the split alignment or the split alignment tunnel is bearing a depressed Central Artery. There is significant construction and air impasse at this point, roughly at the Rowes Wharf development in option 3A. The second full build option the governor would select is called option 5A, which is usually or has usually been described as the seaport access alignment.

In the seaport alignment, seaport access alignment, the third harbor crossing does not utilize the Fort Point Channel, rather, the third harbor crossing in this picture in front of us of option 5A modified, in option 5A the Massachusetts Turnpike is extending behind South

Station, under the Fort Point Channel, through land largely owned by Gilletta and Boston Wharf.

Through land largely owned by the Boston Postal Service, to an alignment that touches the foundation line of the Boston Commonwealth Pier Project and goes into the same Jeffries Cove alignment. This is called option 5A. Option 5A ads are mailed, I don't remember the nav interchange with Northern Avenue and Congre Street. This interchange was designed to serve as an access road from the south and from the west to the developing area of Northern Avenue and South Boston. The purpose of the seaport access concept is to take traffic destined from the developing areas of South Boston off of South Boston streets. There has been a design modification of alternative 5A, which actually appears here. In the design modification of alternative 5A, there's a major interchange which is still being built between the road and Congress Street and Northern Avenue, but a seco interchange is built in the Commonwealth flats area of South Boston, the second interchange connects from the south, from the south and wes

two from the south and west to both Summer Street and Northern Avenue.

The purpose of this design modification is to more effectively intercept trucks which are coming up L Street and Summer Street from the White Fuel area, from the Edison power plant area, and from the Castle Island project owned by Massport.

The purpose of the second interchange is to better meet traffic coming on Summer Street, industrial traffic, and better deal with traffic in the EEIC, Massport's third container port area essentially behind Jimmy's restaurant.

So, if the design modification in the Commonwealth flats area, there is a second interchange from this interchange, you get direct highway connections to the south and to the west but not to the airport.

That is a summary of the design in the Commonwealth flats area of South Boston. Once you made the decision to go to the Commonwealth flats area of South Boston, it is a relatively short distance, about 3,000 feet, from bulkhead line to bulkhead line, which makes for a rather

short and inexpensive tunnel under the harbor, thus, a tunnel is designed from Northern Avenue to the airport, but in option 5 a modified T alignment is, does not come up in the Jeffries Cove area. Instead, the alignment takes its form of a cut-and-cover tunnel through the Bird Island Flats project behind the glass wall in the general aviation area here, behind the glass wall touching the Eastern reservation center and coming out and adjoining with the existing service road of Logan Airport.

The other difference with the option 5A modified is that there is no toll plaza on the Logan Airport side. That is moved over to the more spacious Bird Island Flats area over here, and, secondly, there has been a significant redesign of the project between the previous designs in option 5A, such that the East Boston Memorial Stadium area actually gets larger. When the project is done, there is more public open space available for the East Boston community. Several roads which impinge upon the use of this area have been redesigned in option 5A so that there is an entirely new design in the stadium

area. That summarizes the alternatives that the governor can make. He can go for a redecking option, he can go for an Artery only, he can go for the Tunnel only, or he can go to one of the two full build options, and that summarizes the alternative being assessed this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Secretary Coogan.

That is a ten or fifteen-minute presentation of one of the biggest transportation undertakings ever in the Boston area. At least as somebody said yesterday, since the Tunnel in the Sack Day. In order for you to better understand what Secretary Coogan has described, I will again refer you to handouts in the back of the hall. If you are interested in the project, it will at least give you some fairly reasonable details of the proposals. Also, on this side of the hall, on your right and in other areas we have more detailed graphics of each of the options that Mr. Coogan described, and we have engineers available who will answer detailed questions on those.

Regarding property takings and relocation, none of the alignments that are described in our

viable list of environmental impact draft require any residential displacement at all. All the alignments require some commercial and industrial displacement, and for that reason I am going to read a brief summary of the department's and the Federal Highway Administration's policy on land takings, property takings, and relocation assistance.

Federal and state law requires to compensate fully for any property taking for a transportation project. All the federal property owners are reimbursed for the full fair market value of their property. In addition, the property of the public works department, the bureau provides specialized relocation assistance to each individual property owner and affected business.

If this project goes forward, when the project plans are finalized, DPW staff will interview each business owner and tenant to inform him of all the available benefits to discuss relocation procedures and to answer questions.

A detailed report will be compiled with the special needs of each business, businesses to be displaced or eligible for an actual relocation

expenses and other related expenses. For more detailed information on relocation procedures, there is also among the handouts one on that particular issue. Additionally, we have a representative from the Department of Public Works' Right of Way Bureau who is available and will be available during the day and evening to answer specific relocation or right-of-way questions. I will introduce him now, his name is Michael Mahoney from the Department of Public Works, Right of Way Bureau.

Now, regarding the format of this particular meeting, this is Day Two of the hearing which began at 11 o'clock yesterday morning. The hearing will close at 11 o'clock tonight. We have a list of speakers who have registered to speak, and each is allotted ten minutes. Any of you who want to speak who are not registered, we suggest you go to the back of the room and sign up. It is our experience from yesterday that we can fit almost everybody in that wants to speak in a fairly reasonable short period of time. Between 3 and 6 o'clock this afternoon and until 11 o'clock this evening we have scheduled no speakers and we

use it as free time to whoever or for anyone w
hasn't had a preschaduled time to speak. Agai
I will remind you if you want to testify but
don't want to speak in public, you can write a
letter to the Department of Public Works and y
testimony will be as much a part of the hearin
as if you had testified.

That concludes our introduction. Now I wi
call our first scheduled speaker of the day,
Marvin Miller.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner.

My name is Marvin E. Miller, I live at 185
Pinckney Street in Boston. I appear before yo
today in two separate roles: First, as Chairm
of the Joint Regional Transportation Committee,
the JRTC, and second, as a concerned transporta
engineer.

The JRTC is a federally-mandated body whose
58 members represent the following: The six
signatories of the Metropolitan Planning
Organization, the MPO, 20 cities and towns, 12
public agencies, and 20 citizen groups. The JR
function is to advise the MPO on transportation
policies for the Metropolitan Boston Area

Planning District which encompasses 101 cities and towns.

As part of their responsibilities, the JRTC reviews and advises the MPO on the following federally-required documents: The Unified Planning Work Program, commonly known as the UPWP, the Transportation Plan, which includes the previous Transportation Systems Management Element, or the TSM, and the Transportation Improvement Program, the TIP. It is through these documents that the allocation of transportation funds are made and approved by the Federal Highway Administration, the FHWA, and the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the UMTA.

For the past year, the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction has continuously cooperated with the JRTC and has kept us advised of their plans and activities. On March 23, 1983, the JRTC voted unanimously to advise the MPO to endorse an amendment to the 1983 TIP that would make preliminary engineering funds available for the preparation of an environmental impact statement for the Central Artery/Harbor Crossing project.

The results of this study is now public, an
a decision will soon be reached. As Chairman o
the JRTC, I commend the efforts expended to dat
and encourage the advancement of this most
important transportation project.

The one note of warning that I feel obligat
to give at this point is the cooperation
established must continue and the review proces
must be conducted in a manner that will mitigat
all adverse effects and encourage a partnership
between all interests.

My second statement is offered as a transpo
tion engineer who is concerned with the bleak
transportation situation with which we are
presently faced. The Central Artery is the onl
major conduit that serves the City of Boston, i
is over 30 years old and inadequate to meet the
demands imposed upon it. Additionally, access
and from the airport is not only insufficient,
is outrageous.

We have before us an opportunity to correct
and improve our transportation network in a man
that will benefit all, with minimal interruptio
to the city, its inhabitants, and its visitors.

Should we not avail ourselves of this opportunity, we will soon be faced with an impending crisis.

Boston was recently rejected as a site for a naval facility. One reason given was the poor quality of life. While I do not understand the basis for this determination, I do understand this, that unless something imaginative and constructive is done to improve our highway system quickly, Boston will indeed be deserving of that determination.

As a resident of Boston, and as a transportation engineer, I strongly endorse the concept of a depressed Central Artery, third harbor crossing, and seaport access road. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Would our next speaker that is scheduled for ten minutes please come up?

If any of you want to speak, go sign up and use the microphone, if you wish.

Since we have no speakers, we will recess for a few minutes until I recall the meeting.

[Short recess taken.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to reconvene the hearing.

Our next scheduled speaker is Commissioner William Geary from the Metropolitan District Commission.

We are back on the record, may I have your attention, please? Okay, please proceed, Commissioner Geary.

COMMISSIONER GEARY: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

I would like to thank the Department of Public Works and the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction for the opportunity to appear here today and testify in support of the widening and depression of the Central Artery and a Third Harbor Tunnel. Actually, before I speak on behalf of the agency which I represent, the depression of the Central Artery is the issue that I have been interested in for many years.

I spent five and a half years as a full-time taxi driver in this city, and during that five and a half years I found the Central Artery to be very depressing to me and the passengers that I transported. So, ten years later, now that I have had an opportunity to testify in support of this project, it gives me great personal satisfaction

as well as professional satisfaction.

In essence, today I'm appearing representing the Metropolitan District Commission which has primary responsibility for policing the entire stretch of the expressway known as the Southeast Expressway, the Central Artery and the Northeast Expressway.

I have with me today photographs and statistics which pertain only to that portion of the expressway known as the Central Artery, which we define as the roadway from the City Square on-ramp in Charlestown, traversing the downtown area of Boston, and terminating at the south side of Dewey Square Tunnel as is known as the Mass. Pike off-ramp.

Our agency provides to the Metropolitan police the primary policing of that roadway, we also provide primary emergency response for the road when accidents or any other emergency occurs on the roadway.

Among the reasons that we strongly support the widening and depression of the Artery is that for the number of years that we have provided these police and emergency services, we have

found that this road experiences an inordinately large number of automobile accidents. Indeed, the record for the Central Artery is that it experiences two and one half times the national accident rate for urban highways. Of course, that is not surprising when one realizes that that portion of the road presently carries 160,000 vehicles per day, which totals 58,000,000 vehicles annually.

In preparing for testimony this morning, we did some research of the past two years' accidents statistics compiled by the Metropolitan police In 1981, the last year for which we have total statistics, there were 682 automobile accidents for the Central Artery portion alone, that averages to nearly two a day. What is more startling is that of those accidents, 90 percent of those accidents resulted in some type of personal injury.

We have before you some photographs which we've culled from literally thousands of photographs we have of accidents which have occurred on the Central Artery. Several of them were fatal accidents, and we found that many of the

accidents are attributable to poor design of the present roadway. That is to say that the on-ramps merge with the off-ramps and there's little or inadequate area for acceleration and deceleration.

If you note that the photographs on the east caller on the right top corner, you will notice an automobile which was crushed by a truck. That occurred by the Northern Avenue on-ramp before the tunnel, East Boston/Logan Airport tunnel off-ramp, and that is a classic illustration of many of the kinds of accidents which occur where one vehicle entering the roadway was struck by another vehicle attempting to enter the off-ramp to leave the roadway.

We found it necessary through the years to increase our police patrols because of the high accident rate and because of the absence of breakdown lanes on the expressway and the Central Artery. We've found that we could reduce a large number of accidents by removing as expeditiously as possible disabled vehicles from the road.

To accomplish that, we established in our tactical-oriented patrol squad, special vehicles

Ford Bronco-type vehicles with push bars so that when a vehicle is disabled, we can push it to the nearest off-ramp to remove it from harm's way.

We also operate every weekday starting at 6:30 in the morning through to 9.30, and then resuming in the afternoon at 3 to 6:30 in the evening, two tow trucks which constantly cruise the road to also render motorists assistance and remove disabled vehicles.

We have found in certain periods of adverse weather conditions, an overly hot and humid day or rainy weather or snow conditions, that we will put on that road as many as five vehicles for the purpose of removing disabled vehicles which rise in proportion to inclement weather.

In essence, we believe that the redesign, depression and widening of the Central Artery will improve the safety of the road, require the Metropolitan police to spend fewer hours coping with accidents, and, of course, most importantly of all, reduce the number of injuries and fatalities which are occurring today due to the inadequate design of the road.

In conclusion, I'd also like to address the

other area of concern for this agency.

The Metropolitan District Commission is the agency with primary responsibility for enhancing the environment and livability of this region, particularly the urban areas of this region. And, while we strongly support the depression of the Artery and construction of the Third Harbor Tunnel, we do have some concerns regarding that portion of the roadway which crosses over the Charles River. However, our concerns in that regard are far outweighed in our view with the environmental enhancement of the city. Indeed, removing from the city itself a road which we believe is a substantial blighting influence, and we know that we will have the opportunity to work with the Department of Public Works on design alternatives for that portion of the road which does impact the Charles River Basin, and we hope to utilize that reconstruction as an opportunity to extend the park land which has made the Charles River Basin and the Esplanade area of the Charles River Basin such a beautiful area in the City of Boston. And, hopefully extend that Esplanade on both sides of the

Charles River for the final segment from Leverett Circle to down behind North Station to Charles River Dam, where the river enters the harbor, and of the depression of the Artery, which will not only enhance the environment for the City of Boston, but also is, indeed, a dramatic improvement for that portion of the city which needs some additional park land.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I would be pleased to respond to any questions sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Commissioner. If you want to have your pictures included as part of the testimony, give us some prints and we will include them.

COMMISSIONER MEARY: Thank you. We will be delighted to submit the photographs as exhibits to be attached to the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I am going to reintroduce myself for the benefit of people who have come in late.

My name is Robert Tierney and I'm Commissioner of the Mass. Department of Public Works.

We have a list of preregistered speakers

which we are using now. If you are not on the list but wish to speak, please sign up in the back of the room and we will get to you in a fairly reasonable amount of time.

I believe our next scheduled speaker is Mr. John Larkin Thompson.

All right, then, next on the schedule, since no one has come up to speak, is Thomas Charles Barry, Secretary of Urban Safety.

SECRETARY BARRY: Thank you very much, Commissioner Tierney, for the opportunity to speak on this issue so vital for the residents of Greater Boston, in particular, and all the citizens of the state.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, could I ask you in the background to -- the background noise really interferes with my hearing of the speaker and for the stenotypist.

SECRETARY BARRY: I would like to testify in support of the depression of the expressway and in support of a Third Harbor Tunnel.

I would like to echo the sentiments of Commissioner Geary. There is no real sense in my repeating the story that he told you, but I

have a strange feeling that the additional breakdown lanes will have an effect on the overall safety of the expressway that, at the present time, is nearly impossible to adequately patrol the road because of the difficulty in pulling people over where there is no breakdown lane.

In addition, breakdown lanes will allow disabled cars to stop without putting the driver of that car and the drivers following behind him in a life threatening situation.

The Central Artery has two and a half times the nationwide urban interstate accident rate. At present, short distances between off and on-ramps ask for accident happenings with cars on the Artery having to cross directly off the path before oncoming cars. In addition, safety and emergency vehicles are on patrol in the traffic as the Central Artery gets more and more congested. This would become more and more of a life-threatening situation.

The traffic patterns under the expressway are nearly impossible for even the most experienced Boston driver to figure out, let alone tourists from out of town who often find themselves under

the expressway when traveling between spots like the Quincy Market and the Aquarium.

The proposed Third Harbor Tunnel will divert traffic away from the North End and this reduction in congestion should significantly reduce the accident rate and rate of accidents involving pedestrians in that heavily traveled area.

Mr. Commissioner, I have had the experience of seeing the expressway being built, traversing it before it was opened for traffic, and I just don't think that people realize the enormous amount of traffic that that expressway can handle.

So, I echo the statements of Commissioner Geary, add to them my own, and say that I am here to support the depressing of the Artery and in support of a Third Harbor Tunnel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Barry.

We now have someone who has signed up and we have a free spot at this time, I believe. Would Joseph Rubino come up; is he here?

MR. RUBINO: Thank you, Commissioner.

My name is Joseph Rubino, 220 High Street, Lawrence, Mass.

Standex International Corporation owns

property at 335 "B" Street extension in South Boston on which it conducts operations through its Harding Company Division. The Harding Company is New England's largest supplier of hoisting and rigging equipment. It manufactures wire rope slings and assemblies, chain assemblies, nylon slings and other hoisting and rigging equipment and supplies for this area.

A substantial portion of the business of Harding involves the immediate repair or replacement of slings, chains or other equipment. The company is continually receiving requests from companies such as New England Telephone and other large users of our equipment for an immediate turn-around on repair or replacement. In this time critical business, a central location is essential.

We wish to go on record as being vehemently opposed to alternative 5A which would include a Third Harbor Tunnel to the airport through so-called Commonwealth Flats. This proposal appears to run right through the center of our property and would necessitate relocation of the Harding Company.

Based upon the fact that a relocation would probably mean a less accessible site for Harding, which would result in a decrease in the off-the-street business, we wish to voice our objection to alternative 5A and ask that your consideration of this objection be placed in the record and taken into account when a final decision is made. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Robino. And now, we will call Mr. Thompson again.

Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, Commissioner.

My name is John Larkin Thompson, I serve as the president of Massachusetts Blue Shield with offices at 100 Summer Street in Boston. I am here as the chairman of a subcommittee of what is known as the coordinating committee of Boston, which is an informal association of 24 of the largest businesses operating within the Greater Boston area. That subcommittee was put together to review the EIS statement and to suggest the position of those companies in regard to the proposals contained therein.

The consensus of the subcommittee and of its

parent committee was that the design in regard to both the Tunnel and in regard to the Central Artery as contained within that document of the design document under alternative 5A appeared feasible. Obviously, we are not technical people in the sense of trying to design or redesign what the alternatives would be.

We came to the conclusion, in addition, that we believe that the argument over which project ought to come first, which has gone on for over a decade, was counterproductive in the interest of this Greater Boston community, and that real the Commonwealth should proceed forthwith with both proposals simultaneously.

We recognize that there are major issues to deal with the disruption of businesses within this community, which we will presume will be further addressed as the research goes forward. In particular, we have sensitivity to the very significant problems that the Gillette Company has identified.

All that aside, because we recognize that a project of this dimension must, and we presume, will address those, we believe that the

Commonwealth, as I said before, should proceed forthwith and simultaneously with both proposals.

We presume that there is a sufficient area within the designs being considered to contemplate improvement, and I imagine that would be within the interest of the Commonwealth and certainly the people within the Commonwealth, and that, certainly, in respect to modifications consistent with that.

The members of the subcommittee with which I serve are also participating with the Greater Boston Chamber and its technical committee, which I believe you were informed yesterday will be filing a definitive report with you before the cut-off date.

In conclusion, I will just add that I have personally been a part of a decade of argument over this issue. I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Chairman of the Massport Authority back in the late '60's and early '70's, and I have been personally involved, and, just as a general observation, I find it personally encouraging that maybe we are finally coming to grips with the two major problems in

the area. We should proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Kathy Simon has signed up to speak, and there is now a break in the schedule. If she is here, she is welcome to testify.

For those who haven't heard this, we have approximately a ten-minute time for testifying, but is is quite up in the air.

MS. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Tierney. My name is Kathy Simon, I am the executive director of the East Boston Chamber of Commerce and a resident of East Boston.

My testimony this afternoon is in addition to what you will hear around the clock from our chairman of Industrial and Commercial Developme Richard Alfano. We would like to go on the rec as being in favor of alternative 5A, which would include the widening and depression of the Central Artery with Third Harbor Tunnel via Sou Boston through Jeffries Cove to the airport.

Some have said that there is going to be sacrifices by East Boston. We believe that the only sacrifice will be in the volume of cars th we have that are nonresidential going through t

community. But, there have been statements and praise for the one-way toll system that has been implemented, and now is going to be permanently in place, and all that is very advantageous for the Boston side of the city. But, East Boston is now experiencing greater hardship as a result of this one-way toll.

We believe this is because of the lack of convenience of having the 30 cents out to throw in, where you were able to do that before. We would like to recommend to the Commission that the one-way toll will be included in the EIS and in the permanent plan, but that the Mass. Turnpike Authority and Massachusetts Port Authority mint tokens that are valued at 60 cents or whatever value, or at whatever value the residence or commuter cost is, so that it will increase the flow of traffic from the East Boston side through the Tunnel and eliminate the need to go to a booth and hand in the ticket.

We feel although the initial expense will be a little bit higher in the printing of the commuter ticket, that ultimately the reuse and recycling of these tokens will prove to be very

cost effective in increasing the flow of traffic from the East Boston side.

Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For any of you who are here, we have ten minutes free if anyone would like to speak before the next registered speaker. Or, any of you who have been here before and have listened to it all day, we have a preregistration for people who are speaking. We have enough gaps in that preregistration to take care of people who have not registered and want to speak. All they have to do is get on the list and go to the back of the hall and get their name registered. One of the people who has done that is Louis Russo. If he is here, he can testify right now.

Even though this is a formal public hearing, you don't have to wear a tie, it is not that formal.

MS. SIMON: If it is possible, I would like to amend my testimony. I believe I said the 5A alternative, and I would like to go on the record for the East Boston Chamber of Commerce, we meant the 5A alternative route which will be

directly to the Bird Island Flats.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 5A modified?

MS. SIMON: Yes, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Russo?

MR. RUSSO: I am Louis Russo, an East Boston resident.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, a decent respect for the democratic process dictates that the will of the people be heard, and further that the will of the people prevail.

Instead, a power structure, the kind of industrial and political complex has conspired to subvert the will of the people and has proceeded to impose its will upon the people; specifically, upon the people in the impacted areas. It can do this because the areas involved are lived in by people who are ill-equipped professionally and financially to raise an effective voice in opposition.

The one democratic tool which gives equal weight to the preferences of rich and poor alike, the ballot, has been conveniently ignored. The alternatives of a project as monumental as this one ought to be submitted to voters in the

impacted areas, and on a special ballot. And, the result of that vote should guide the governor and the federal authorities in making their decisions.

That is the democratic way, that is the process of which this herald hall is symbolic.

I suggest when this process is undermined, all of us are poorer for it.

Mine is a small voice and will likely go unheard amid the tumult of strong voices in favor of the harbor tunnel. But, like Dr. Seuss's lament, I speak for the trees, or, in this case, for the little people.

It will be felt, of course, by the access of progress for profits. But, like Jobe, our integrity will remain intact. I wonder how many pro-tunnelers will be able to say that, I wonder?

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Russo.

Our next scheduled speaker is Joseph Mullaney.

MR. MULLANEY: Thank you, Mr. Tierney.

My name is Joseph Mullaney, I'm a senior vice president and general counsel of Gillette Company, and I'm appearing here today on behalf

of the Gillette Company.

Since 1904, when The Gillette Company first began to manufacture razors and blades at its present location in South Boston, the company has been a strong and contributing member of the Boston community. Nearly 60 percent of all razor blades sold in the United States are produced in that location. Today, the company's facility in South Boston employs about 3,000 of our 4200 Boston employees, many of them residents of the City of Boston. The annual payroll of the company for the South Boston facility is approximately $65 million.

We would first like to make it clear that Gillette favors transportation projects which would alleviate the problems associated with traveling in and around the City of Boston. Gillette is not opposed to widening and depressing the Central Artery, nor is it opposed to a seaport access road or a Third Harbor Tunnel. Gillette is opposed, however, to transportation proposals which will damage the Fort Point Channel and threaten Gillette's operations in South Boston.

We believe that the construction proposals in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement wi cause such damage, both to the Channel and te Gillette's operations. Our major concerns are as follows: In general, there is the overall impact on the development potential of the Fort Point Channel. As related to Gillette specifi ly, our concerns are: Water displacement, disruption of operations due to vibrations, disruption of operations due to interrupted access to the facility, effect on expansion pl loss of storage tank capacity.

First, let me discuss the project's impact on the potential of the Channel.

On May 31st a "Boston Globe" editorial entitled: "Boston's Valuable Channel," noted that the vitality and the visual interest of t Fort Point Channel has already sparked the imagination of developers and lured prime commercial and residential tenants to the area. The loss of the Fort Point Channel, as it exist today, would be deeply felt by Gillette. But, it would be a tragedy for Boston.

Second, water displacement. Since 1926,

Gillette has made extensive use of the water in the Fort Point Channel to operate its cooling and power equipment. Current operations have been using approximately 39 gallons of water a day. At full capacity, the system is designed to use 58 million gallons of water a day. This water must be of the proper temperature and quality. Without this water, we cannot operate in South Boston.

If a Tunnel, depressed Artery or seaport access road is constructed in the Channel, Gillette would be deprived of a sufficient water supply of proper temperature and quality, rendering the equipment that depends on this water inoperable.

It has been suggested in the Dreft Environmental Impact Statement that Gillette's existing water intake pipe be extended from its present location all the way into Boston Harbor. This is unacceptable from an operational standpoint.

The additional costs of pumping, cleaning, and maintaining a pipe seven times the length of our present pipe would be substantial. Questions of ownership of the pipe and the seabed on which

they would rest would require resolution. Fort issues of access and safety must be addressed.

Our third concern is the matter of vibratio Under any of the proposed alternatives, the construction will cause vibrations which may up the use of precision inspection and manufacturi equipment at Gillette's facility. Some of our procedures demand tolerances to within five ten-thousandths of an inch. In addition, under alternative 5A, the permanent traffic flow would cause continuing vibration problems.

Our fourth concern is the disruption of our operations due to restricted access to the facility for employees, suppliers, visitors and trucking, a disruption that would last for the long period of construction, and in some cases, permanently.

Fifth is the concern that we have about the impact on future expansion plans for the Fort Point Channel and for Gillette. The potential for the Fort Point Channel for business and recreational development has been recognized for years, and the current proposals would hinder those options. Likewise, for Gillette, any

options for further development on the company's current site would be severely limited.

Finally, under alternative 5A, Gillette's large underground storage tanks at the South Boston facility, which are vital to its operations, are located on the land proposed to be taken. Whether there is a suitable alternative site for these tanks has not yet been determined.

Let me reiterate that Gillette is in favor of improvements in traffic problems in and around the Boston area and improved access to the seaport and the airport. It is, however, our firm belief that any construction associated with a relocated or depressed Artery, a seaport access road or a Third Harbor Tunnel, should not have serious negative impacts on the Fort Point Channel or Gillette. We believe changes can be made which would mitigate these negative impacts. Representatives of the Executive Office of Transportation, Construction, and your Department of Public Works, working with engineers representing Gillette, have drafted certain design refinements of the proposals for construction in and around the Fort Point Channel as those proposals are contained in the

Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The engineers for the Commonwealth and our engineers have agreed that these refinements are technically feasible and do not significantly change the alternatives presently proposed.

It was also indicated that these refinements would be reflected in the final Environmental Impact Statement. While these modifications would not resolve all of Gillette's concerns, they would mitigate to a significant extent the adverse effects on the Fort Point Channel and on Gillette of the present proposals following consideration of information developed through this Third Harbor Tunnel and depression of the Central Artery. If these refinements are included in the final EIS as part of the preferred alternative for construction in and around the Fort Point Channel, they will be acceptable to Gillette.

I have asked Dr. Poulous of GeoTech Engineers, Inc., to provide you with a summary of these proposals.

Dr. Poulous?

DR. POULOUS: Alternative 5A as described

in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and in its supplement occupies a substantial proportion of Fort Point Channel. Approximately 40 percent of the volume of water would be displaced as it currently is described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In order to eliminate that impact, we looked at various alternatives, and the one selected can be very simply understood by thinking of the two parts of alternative 5A modified that are in the Fort Point Channel, that is, the northbound Central Artery, which passes along the west side of the Fort Point Channel, from Gillette at its southerly end, up towards Summer Street, and the seaport access tunnel, which runs from the Massachusetts Turnpike and crosses the Fort Point Channel immediately in front of the Gillette property.

The alternate that has been suggested is to take both of those legs of the new routes in alternative 5A modified, and to lower them down so that the tops of these tunnels would lie entirely beneath the bed or practically entirely beneath the bed of the Fort Point Channel.

Therefore, although there would be construction impacts while they were being built, the permanent impact on the Fort Point Channel would be very small. The impacts on the Channel itself and on Gillette would be mitigated greatly by impressing these two lanes of the highway system beneath the bed of the Channel.

As part of this system, Dorchester Avenue would be moved more westerly from the location that is given in the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement, and the filling required for the Fort Point Channel would only extend up to approximately Dorchester Avenue, rather than all the way in front of Gillette, and no filling would be needed on the west bank of the Channel all the way up to the north by Summer Street. If Dorchester Avenue is reopened and added on top of the northbound Central Artery, which is now depressed below the bed of the Channel, it could be supported with well-designed columns and would not occupy any volume of the Channel, although it would occupy some of the surface area of the Channel so that it would be seen as occupying a portion of the west side.

That's a summary of the alternative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mullaney and Dr. Poulous.

Our next scheduled speaker is Secretary Evelyn Murphy.

MS. MURPHY: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

I am Everlyn Murphy, the State Secretary for Urban Affairs, and I thank you for this opportunity to testify before you this afternoon.

Let me say, first, that I strongly support the 5A modified plan in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report. Members of the business community have spent a lot of time looking at the draft and analyzing the effects and will be testifying in more detail about their thoughts and concerns, and I would urge you to weigh their suggestions carefully.

From my conversations with the business leaders, there is a widespread support for the proposed project, but some of the details need to be ironed out, and those can be done in the time and fashion, I think, particularly what you have just heard from Gillette, the way those can preclude the kind of detailed response to their

concern will be particularly important to all of us.

So, let me turn my comments, Mr. Commissioner, to speak more to the issue of many working people in Massachusetts and how this proposal effects them.

The depression of the Central Artery and the Third Harbor Tunnel using seaport alignment can make significant contribution to Massachusetts' workers and business people. Let me explain some of the issues that I think are particularly important.

All of us in Massachusetts depend on a complex trucking operation for our basic survival for the movement of produce and so that that food can be put on our tables every day. We are importing, as you know, about 80 percent of the food we consume, and whether it is the imported goods or the produce moving from western Massachusetts or from the Cape to places like the Chelsea distribution center, we essentially rely on that kind of distribution and access to those roadways for the daily food that we put on our tables.

Nearly all of that food is transported by truck, and, incidentally, are all perishable.

Countless hours spent in traffic jams and delays on the Central Artories cause Massachusetts residents a great deal of money for basic staples and diminish the quality of produce that eventually becomes our dinners.

Let's take a different example. That is, the tourists of the 1990's.

Withstanding the capacities of the new hotels, those that have the commute from the Cape, the Berkshires, Heritage Plantation, from Lowell and Lawrence and Fall River and Gardner, throughout the state, with all of this potential, Boston, Massachusetts, has now been in for an enormous tourist business in the next decade. A Third Harbor Tunnel can offer a better access for those tourists coming from the airport directly into Boston. Moreover, the Tunnel assures better access for business people in the increasingly national and international marketplace that we find this state in. From Boston, the Bird Island Flats, downtown financial services in the computer software ventures, as well as exporting all

manner of manufactured goods, the state and business people need access to Logan Airport and business people from outside of Massachusetts and from outside of the United States need access to us.

Many, many jobs depend on the vitality of our trading elsewhere. Logan is the gateway to much of that trade.

Finally, let me make one point clear. Select people, workers, many of us who rely on the Central Artery to get to our jobs, to and from them, and to our work every day, have to use the Artery on days off to gain access to the North Shore beaches or the South Shore beaches for a little relaxation, and we depend on that Artery every day. During a time when we need to insure that Massachusetts remains competitive with other states and nations, we simply cannot afford to hold our major resources or our people stalled in traffic. Equally important is the frustration of the experience of spending hours away from leisure time for unnecessary long commutes from work or leisure that cannot help but affect the quality of our lives.

Massachusetts workers, consumers, truckers, business persons, and tourists, we all wear one or another of these hats in some ways every single day. I use these examples, Mr. Commissioner, for one purpose, to illustrate that fundamentally both the proposed highway improvement and the new Tunnel affects us and our economic well-being. The Tunnel alone will not solve the produce problem or the daily worker's frustrations on the Artery. The Artery alone won't solve access problems for tourists and outside business persons. But, taken together, the depressed Central Artery improvement and a new Third Harbor Tunnel along the support alignment offers this fundamental, economic well-being of the people in Massachusetts. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Secretary Murphy.

Our next scheduled speaker is Elizabeth Bransfield.

MS. BRANSFIELD: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

Before I begin, may I commend you for the seating arrangement. It is psychologically helpful at least to be on the same level as those in authority.

My name is Elizabeth Bransfield and I am the president of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. The MAPC is the official regional planning agency for the 101 cities and towns in the Boston Metropolitan area. The agency conducts economic development, environmental, land use, and transportation planning for the region and its member communities. By state regulation, MAPC reviews all environmental impact analyses for projects in the Boston Metropolitan area.

Our agency has participated in the review and analysis of the Third Harbor Tunnel and Central Artery projects since they were first considered as corridor planning studies. We participated in the interagency meetings and have conducted exhaustive reviews of the variety of technical documents produced as part of the project.

There is no question that the construction of a third Tunnel and the depression of the Central Artery will serve an important need and improve traffic in the core area.

However, in addition to the traffic benefits, it is important that consideration be given all

the other impacts that may develop during the construction process, the impacts that the projects will have on Boston neighborhoods in the future, the overall environmental impact of the facilities, and the impact that the new facility will have on the city's and the region's future development and economic growth.

The third Tunnel and Central Artery projects are being considered at a time when many other transportation improvements are being recommended, such as improvements to North and South Stations, green line improvements to Cambridge, development in South Boston, and major highway improvements in Charlestown, to mention a few.

It is therefore essential that these projects be considered not only on their own merits but in the context of an overall transportation system for the Metropolitan Boston area.

In an even broader context, the transportation system must strengthen, help revitalize, and enhance the amenities and the quality of life in the Metropolitan area.

These overall benefits may significantly outweigh the localized impacts of the Central

Artery and harbor crossing, whether beneficial or adverse. It is the role of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council to look at the Central Artery/ Harbor Tunnel projects in this broader overall context and to consider how the area will be served best within the limits of realistically available funding and the purposes for which the funding may be used.

The council, representing local elected officials in the comprehensive planning process, has established a special Third Harbor Tunnel/ Central Artery task force to conduct a detailed review of the technical documents and of the expected effects on the region.

In the course of that third special task force studies, it will be addressing the concerns raised by the gentleman from The Gillette Company.

The position of the council and its recommendations to the governor will be made on August 22, and may include the choice of the best alternative for the region and recommendations for modifications or conditions to maximize benefits to the Boston Metropolitan area and its residents.

Citizens and local officials are invited to

express their concerns to MAPC by August 17 in order to insure their consideration by the August 22 deadline.

Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, very much.

Our next scheduled speaker is Mr. John Crosier.

We will now take a brief recess until our next speaker arrives.

[Recess taken.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to reconvene now. Our next scheduled speaker is John Crosier.

Mr. Crosier?

MR. CROSIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is John Crosier, and I'm the executive director from the Massachusetts Business Round Table, Incorporated, a statewide organization of the largest private sector employers with approximately 360,000 employees. Our purpose is to work for a strong, competitive economic climate for Massachusetts business so that we can grow more jobs here.

The Massachusetts transporation system, and in particular the proposals under consideration

today, are of vital concern to any sound economic policy. Access to Logan Airport and the Port of Boston are of obvious interest to all Massachusetts businesses. Seaport remains a key element in providing effective air and water transportation for people and freight. Sixteen percent of Massachusetts jobs is directly related to exports and much of those are shipped from Logan Airport or the Port of Boston.

Because of our diverse economic base, the Massachusetts economy is uniquely positioned to witness strong job growth. However, that growth depends on substantially improved access to Logan Airport, which is critical to the types of employees that our economy can attract and the types of goods we need to move through that international airport. With automobile traffic at a virtual standstill during commuter hours and with businesses relying on trucking for shipment of deliveries continually thwarted by erratic schedules brought about by traffic congestion, a status quo decision to do nothing is clearly not an alternative.

As we look forward to increased opportunities

to better compete in national and international markets, improved access to Logan and the movement of traffic through our capital city must be addressed now. We applaud the very vigorous efforts of the administration to forge a consensus resolution of the many problems surrounding these difficult choices.

We believe that both a Third Harbor Tunnel and a solution to the Central Artery problem are required now.

The Massachusetts Business Round Table does not have the technical resources to comment on the specifics of the various alternatives, but we do know that if a resolution is not reached very soon, then all of us will feel the negative impact.

The Massachusetts Business Round Table's framework includes a chamber of commerce network which obviously includes the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

Our executive committee has determined that the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce is the organization to whom we will look for background research and guidance on this issue.

We are assured that a special committee of

the Boston Chamber of Commerce will provide its recommendations and analysis of the various options by mid-August. We believe that because of their greater study of this issue and the fact that the most significant economic impact will be upon the Boston business community, it is appropriate to await the results of their review. Until we have that analysis, we think it is not appropriate for us to make a more comprehensive statement.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crosier.

Our next scheduled speaker is Richard D'Ellorfa

MR. D'ELLORFANO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Richard D'Ellorfano and I'm a member of the Board of East Boston Chamber of Commerce, presently chairman of the industrial commercial section.

I have been authorized by the East Boston Chamber of Commerce to testify on behalf of our third harbor crossing.

I have attended many workshop meetings which were held at 27 School Street in Boston, spoke with the engineers present as well as

representatives of the State Department of Public Works, and other interested parties, and expressed our concerns relative to the plans then being addressed.

Due to the participation of our district, which would occur if the railroad alignment were favored, we were opposed to that as well as additional toll booths on the East Boston end of the crossing because of the air pollution which is already more than we can bear.

The Dukakis/Salvucci plan, which recently came forward, alternative 5A modified has addressed all of our concerns; a split alignment Tunnel, a depressed Artery, and a seaport access road in South Boston with toll booths on airport property.

Although work on this project should be accomplished simultaneously, the priorities in our view to allow this district some relief from congestion are, one, first to work on the third harbor crossing; two, the seaport access route, and, finally, the Control Artery depression.

Thank you, very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. D'Ellerfano.

Our next scheduled speaker is Mr. Albert, is Mr. Albert here?

Well, we have a speaker who signed up for testifying and we will fill the gap with the speaker.

Is Maurice Simonean here?

MR. SIMONZAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As president of the cargo community of New England, with over 250 members of the cargo community at Logan Airport, which consists of porters, brokers, airlines and commercial accounts, I wish to be recorded as in support of the Third Harbor Tunnel.

With the development of the Bird Island Flats complex, which includes the only trade-free zone located at a major international airport in this country. We have a vital interest to see improvement of access to and from Logan International Airport.

In 1982 we handled a half a billion pounds of cargo for 4,000 firms representing $11 billion worth of revenue. Through the first quarter of 1983, we are running 28 percent ahead of 1982 figures.

If we are to remain the vital and competitive part of the community at Logan conducting air cargo business, we will require an efficient roadway system for Logan Airport.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. Albert here?

We will take a brief recess.

[Brief recess taken.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would now like to reconvene the meeting.

We have a speaker who has signed up recently, Thomas Hogan. Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: I would just like to say that, as both a resident and someone who works in Boston, I would like to speak out as certainly in favor of the depressed Central Artery and also for the new Harbor Tunnel having the less adverse effect on both the Fort Point Channel and East Boston neighborhood.

Now, I work on the waterfront, but I do not live there. So, even though I will have to continue to traverse this area, which I am sure is an inconvenience to me, but I think that as

far as a long-term situation for the city, the mere fact of the depressed Artery to replace the current eyesore and conditions that are here in the Central Arteries, it is worth it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Our next scheduled speaker is Paul Eustace, Secretary of Labor, Secretary Eustace?

MR. EUSTACE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few brief statements.

The project as planned is projected to cost $2.2 billion, 90 percent which will be federally financed, it will require 63,000 persons a year of working construction, concrete, heavy industry, and the like. Approximately 6,000 jobs per year will be provided, assuming the construction year life. Of these jobs, 25 percent will go to downtown Boston area residents for a total of jobs for 11,000 local residents who will be employed over the life of the project.

Other job information is: 46,000 jobs will be involved on site, 17,000 jobs that are most likely out of state. Between $40 million and $70 million in state income taxes will be

generated from wages paid during the construction project. The construction jobs and moneys involved serve as a multiplier effect; since 20 acres of lands will be freed up for development by depressing the Central Artery, the new projection will be $5 to 10 million in long-term tax revenues, which will be very helpful for the city and state. Projects will create better access to the airports and because of the delivery system of goods and service in New England, the regional economy will drastically improve.

For example, the anticipated growth in southeastern Mass. will be supported by the improved access route to the airport. The multiplier effect also means that with $2.2 billion [illegible]ont on construction, over $3.5 billion in household items and industrial sales will accrue, and we speak today of the proposed programs and I think the state needs them, they have been too long in coming and they should be put into effect as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Again, we will have a short re[illegible]ss until our next speaker or someone signs up, someone who wants to speak.

[Short recess taken.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our next scheduled speaker is Carol Sanduck from the Massachusetts League of Women Voters.

MS. SANDUCK: Good afternoon. My name is Carol Sanduck and I'm the transportation specialist for the Massachusetts League of Women Voters.

Representing over 100 local organizations, the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts has evaluated this proposal with regard to its impact on regional transportation in Massachusetts. After careful consideration, we have chosen to support the proposal which incorporates depressing and widening the Central Artery with additional access to the airport via the new alignment for the Third Harbor Tunnel, alternative 5A or 5A modified.

The League's commitment to public transportation remains strong. We worked to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1972 to permit

financing part of the costs of urban mass transit from highway trust funds.

The League also supported the National Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1974, and, locally, we worked for a state constitutional amendment allowing flexible use of highway funds for public transportation.

Even with these changes in policy, the League recognizes the realities that cities do not have the opportunity to plan and adequately finance integrated transportation systems of their own design. We believe the highway trust fund should be restricted to allow cities and states the flexibility to build whatever form of ground transit they deem necessary.

Interstate moneys designated for Boston's Third Harbor Tunnel could be transferred to transit and other highway projects; but the political reality is that we would probably end up with little more than the $800 million currently approved for the Tunnel.

Approving the Tunnel option could effectively more than double the amount of money received. The availability of large federal grants for

construction rather than maintenance and operation unfortunately, drives local decision making.

A strong transit network is crucial to the viability of the region. The League recognizes the need for compatible, workable, integrated public transportation and highway systems. Our national position on urban policy states that the League of Women Voters believes it is in the national interest to promote the well-being of America's cities.

Clearly, improving mobility through and to the Boston area will increase economic development and stimulate growth, vital not only to Boston, but to the region as well. We believe the proposed project is necessary to improve this mobility and thus Boston's well-being.

Environmental impact is another concern of ours. The proposal reflects careful attention to air quality, water quality, noise and vibration effects in Boston. We feel this project also presents an unusual opportunity to increase safeguards and monitoring processes during and after construction. We urge stringent standards and enforcement.

Another form of pollution is visual blight, and most would welcome elimination of the monstrous green giant which covers and shadows Boston. What safeguards, however, will protect the 20 new acres of land to be developed over the Central Artery? The League urges careful planning and management of this potential gift.

It is admirable that the most recent proposal does not take any residential housing, thereby minimizing long-term disruption to the communities. The extent to which commercial takings are discussed is also commendable, but we urge further study.

Commercial entities are not isolated units. Their disruption will affect job changes which in turn will effect families which in turn will affect the community. Although not as obvious and dramatic an event as the destruction of housing in a community, commercial takings have a definite impact on the region. Additional consideration of the individuals who will be affected by these takings is needed. The people involved may be few in number but the impact on their lives and the region will be great.

Recently there has been discussion of possible public transportation uses for the proposed harbor tunnel. Restricted bus and carpool lanes are cited as examples. The League urges state transportation officials to consider increasing the use of alternatives to the private auto for traveling to and from the airport.

The cost of this enormous project is of serious concern. It is imperative that the Commonwealth's ten percent share not be drawn from revenues potentially available to public transportation. In addition, the League strongly supports user cost-sharing measures to provide funds for maintaining these roads.

We would like to thank the Executive Office of Transportation and Construction for allowing us to testify today. They should be commended for their efforts to involve the public in this process.

The availability of documents, the number and location of meetings, and the extended hours for testimony reflect a sincere effort under severe time constraints to maximize public participation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our next scheduled speaker is Betsy Johnson from the Boston League of Women Voters.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is Betsy Johnson. I am the transportation community chairperson for the Boston League of Women Voters.

Where the League of Women Voters of Massachusetts has reviewed the proposed project as to its costs and benefits and effects on the overall region, the Boston League concentrated on the impacts to the City of Boston itself, particularly the effects on neighborhoods and the quality of city life.

The League of Women Voters' position is based on study and member consensus at three levels: national, state and local. The local position's primary emphasis is for projects which provide a more efficient and extensive public transportation system. There is a need to reduce the historic imbalance between mass transit and highway construction and use.

The transportation system must be balanced and projects must consider the entire transportation network. Our earlier objections to the

Third Harbor Tunnel arose because it was a piecemeal approach.

The proposed project may be massive, but it does begin to include an entire portion of the transportation system. Although the Boston League will continue to urge for upgrading and ongoing evaluation of further transit improvements to encourage greater use of public transportation to the airport, we also recognize that public transit alone will not solve the future traffic problems.

At the original Third Harbor Tunnel scoping hearing, the Boston League testified that four additional alternatives should be considered. We are pleased that three of our suggestions, particularly those concerning the Central Artery, have now been included.

However, the need to consider alternative transit options still has not been adequately addressed. There is the concern that if the project before us today is built, there will be little remaining moneys for the transit aspects of the system which also need improvement. What

commitments to transit can be included in this project?

We suggest that any tunnel include designated lanes and be part of a mass transit system between South Station and Logan Airport. We support the designated bus ramp from Dewey Square. Toll levels should be set high enough so as to be able to provide revenues needed for transit improvements.

Overall, the Draft Environmental Impact Report indicates a number of positive aspects or benefits to the project. From our local prospective, there is, most importantly, the opportunity to repair the negative impacts that resulted from building the Central Artery through city neighborhoods in the 1950's.

The city can be again linked visually and physically by removing the elevated highway. Noise can be reduced and air pollution channeled. There is concern, however, that the reconstructed area will continue to be designed based on a street, the new surface artery. The parcels depicted in figure 101, page 278, indicate this.

There must be much, much more discussion by

the citizens, land use planning of the entire corridor, and only then a determination of the configuration and uses of the parcels and road. Perhaps it would be best if it were impossible to go between the Artery ramps on the surface, so traffic will not be tempted to use the surf to pick and choose its entry onto the Artery. The report does not adequately address the imp of the use of the surface streets by hazardous cargo trucks. The surface street planning and design aspect to the project must be done simultaneously with the continued planning of the depression project. This is especially tru since additional footings for higher buildings over the depressed Artery must be constructed a the Tunnel is being built.

The modifications to the 5A alternative reflect attempts to reduce the impacts on Boston neighborhoods. The aim must continue to be to reduce commuter traffic and commercial through traffic off of neighborhood streets. The extens of I-90 to the expanding commercial and industri area of South Boston is very much needed to redu the disruptive truck traffic that now passes

through the residential area.

Additional modifications to the exit ramp onto East Berkeley Street are needed. Traffic should flow onto an upgraded, two-way herald street, which is removed from residences, instead of onto Berkeley Street. Further consideration of alternatives concerning the relocation of Dorchester Avenue and the location of the Tunnel beneath it is needed. The present configuration excessively impacts the Fort Point Channel. The final report should reprint 71 and 73, pages 14 and 15. The maps in the draft document make public review of the specifics of the proposals very difficult.

It is hoped that the Central Artery project could bring better coordination between the MDC Charles River Basin plans and the other development plans in the adjacent area.

The League requests that the measures to minimize the disruption in the Leverett Circle area, page 283, be implemented. Pedestrian access and walkways must be a priority in this area, and all modifications which could make the bridges more attractive and reduce shadows should be

implemented.

Again, figures 103 and 104, pages 287 and 289, in the draft report are of very poor quality and make public review difficult.

Any modifications which minimize the disrupt to the neighborhood and recreational facilities of East Boston should be adopted. The alternati which require no taking of residences are to be commended.

The concern for the relocation of commercial establishments does not adequately address that there is a declining quantity of lower-class commercial space in downtown Boston. Also, the is insufficient discussion as to whether nearby businesses will be able to withstand the disruptions such as noise, dirt, limited access, caused by the construction.

What will be the real economic costs of the construction? Will those hurt by the construct be able to share in the after-construction prosperity?

The League of Women Voters of Boston thanks you for this opportunity to participate. We as that public participation continue to be a

priority of the project. An outline of the ongoing public participation process should be in the final document. We suggest that neighborhood by neighborhood project committees be established and meet often. A number of decisions affecting residents, which have just been mentioned, need community input soon. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Is Mr. Albert here?

He was scheduled to speak earlier.

How about Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Edward Pendergast, I'm the chairman of the Massachusetts Small Business Council and a former president of the Small Business Association of New England, and I am involved in the small business community.

I have come here today to commend the secretary of transportation for his proposal to depress the Central Artery and to build the Third Harbor Tunnel to Logan Airport, which will be accessed from the west.

The Small Business Association in and around Boston is critical to the survival of this area.

Certainly, the current Southern Artery inhibits business growth. The strong need for accesses to Logan Airport to be improved will facilitate business and allow it to stimulate its growth.

Consideration of the various alternatives leads to the conclusion that a combination of the broadened, depressed Central Artery and extended access to Logan Airport by land be adopted.

A third Tunnel without improving the Artery will not permit adequate access. Depressing the Artery will facilitate access to the city, and apparently it can be built by keeping the upper portion opened while obviating any disaster of complete shutdown of the Artery.

Thank you from the Small Business Foundation and for allowing us participation in this proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

Our next speaker is registered, but has not signed up to speak until 2 o'clock. If any of you want to speak, go to the back of the room and register. If you want to provide testimony and not speak, we can put it in as testimony as

if you so spoke regarding your views of the third harbor crossing, Central Artery improvement, you can do that by sending it to the Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston, Massachusetts, and if it is received by August 22nd, it will become a part of this record as if so testified.

If there are no speakers, we will now take a short recess.

[Brief recess taken.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to reconvene the meeting, please.

I'm going to reintroduce myself for the benefit of the people who just came in.

My name is Robert Tierney, I'm the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works. With me now, who will assist me and take over the hearing, is Robert McDonagh, the chief engineer of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. Tierney.

Our next scheduled speaker is Kristin Demong, director of the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security. Ms. Demong?

MS. DEMONG: Hello, I'm Kristin S. Demong,

Director of the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security. I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak on the proposal to depress and widen the Central Artery.

Last Friday, my office announced the Commonwealth's latest unemployment rate. Once again, Massachusetts posted an unemployment rate far below both the national average and the average of the ten large industrial states. Why then am I here today to testify to the vital importance of this project to the Massachusetts economy and employment picture?

It is simple. Massachusetts' continued economic health depends on transportation, getting people to and from jobs, sending its goods to market, stimulating consumer spending, and, of course, attracting new industries and employers to the Commonwealth.

None of us should forget that our strong position relative to the rest of the country is a recent phenomenon. Indeed, when the Central Artery was completed in 1959, our economic growth was so sluggish that not one office building had been built in downtown Boston since the onset of

the Great Depression. And, it wasn't until 1978 that our level of unemployment finally dropped below the national average.

Neither should we forget that within the 92 cities and towns that make up the Boston standard Metropolitan area, there are over 95,000 men and women who want to work and are not getting jobs. This project, which would create some 5,000 construction jobs yearly and 10,000 other jobs would have a significant direct impact on our economy. It would also generate a long-term ripple effect throughout the regional economy and towns by increasing these workers' purchasing power and by strengthening our industries, like high technology and business services, which depend upon regional markets.

We must consider, as well, the significant cost of not improving this roadway.

Massachusetts has experienced literally generations of hard times and we must never assume that our present situation will continue without careful planning. To allow the further deterioration of the Central Artery will sharply limit the Massachusetts economy's ability to grow and to

respond to the challenge of new technologies and changing markets.

Historically Massachusetts' greatest economic asset is our talent to develop new industry and to adapt to the needs of these industries. An efficient transportation system is crucial to maintaining, let alone improving, Massachusetts economic health. For all these reasons, I urge you to approve this project.

Thank you, very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is either Mr. Tremblay or Mr. Anzone here?

All right, may we have another speaker, is Mr. Swidor here?

MR. SWIDER: Good afternoon, my name is Eric Swidor, president of The New England Council.

The Council is a privately-funded associati with 1200 firms whose members collectively empl over 25 percent of the work force in the six-state area.

The Council's mission since 1925 has been t improve economic conditions for the New England region. Our focus of attention since 1978 has been on national and regional issues that impac

the business climate here. To that end, we primarily work on energy, budget, and tax and regulatory matters under debate in the Congress of the United States and in federal agencies.

There are several matters, however, including management of hazardous waste and transportation issues which are of concern to our organization because of their regional economic implications.

To that end, we generally work very closely with other associations which our members support whose charter is more statewide or local in scope, and who can focus greater resources at developing acceptable local solutions.

Logan Airport is an important regional facility, and over the years, The New England Council has supported its growth and expansion and improved access to that facility. Like our magnificent regional resources of colleges and universities, medical facilities, financial institutions, Logan's viability is a major contributor to our current good state of economic health.

It is a gateway to the world that not only allows for an extraordinary concentration of high

technology manufacturing here, but also has lur firms like Wheelabrator-Frye and Congoleum to locate their international corporate headquarte in New Hampshire.

As we continue to become increasingly depen on foreign trade and exporting our products and services, Logan's accessibility continues to gr in importance. Improving access to Logan Airpo by constructing a Third Harbor Tunnel has been a Council priority for at least a decade. We understand that Mr. Salvucci and his staff have devised a creative, new possibility labeled the "seaport access route" which generally has met with considerable positive support from our members who are knowledgeable of that scheme. We like positive solutions and we respect Fred's creativeness, and therefore, lend our support again to making the third harbor crossing a priority with strong emphasis on working the bu out of the seaport access route and making it the preferred technique.

Solving the Central Artery problem makes infinitely good economic development sense, especially if you pull a Houdini, make it happe

instantly and not have to live with the six to eight-traffic nightmare that doing it might result in.

As a South Shore resident who commutes to Boston on the Southeast Expressway each morning, I am one of the 100,000 experts available to discuss traffic nightmares. The Central Artery proposals seem to raise questions about whether the cure is worse than the disease. The Central Artery clearly is to Boston what the main artery is to one's body; restricting its flow over a long period of time could end up killing what is otherwise a reasonably healthy individual.

The business community, through local organizations that have looked at proposed courses of action have raised a number of very legitimate concerns that simply need to be dealt with. The economic viability of the New England region could be severely impacted depending on how this piece of microsurgery is performed. There are many factors that contribute to our region's current economic revival, access to Logan, and the ability to get in and out of New England's major city, continue to be reasonably high on

that list.

There is no doubt in our minds that a third harbor crossing will contribute significantly to continued and expanded regional prosperity and should be pursued aggressively and done forthwith.

There is little doubt that dealing with the Central Artery problem should also be a top priority and a coordinated solution to both problems is highly desirable.

The ways and means of accomplishing a coordinated solution without seriously disrupting the region's economy is unclear enough to knowledgeable observers so that we believe considerable discussion and negotiation needs to take place before we decide to leap in with both feet.

In summary, the Council believes we should both go and go slow. Go right away on the third harbor crossing, and proceed as quickly as possible on the Central Artery solution, recognizing that legitimate concerns of local business leaders must be satisfied.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Snider. The

next scheduled speaker is Frank Trombley and George Anzone, are they here?

Since they are not here, we have a speaker who has signed up today. I now call Marie Marshall, if she is here?

MS. MARSHALL: My name is Marie Marshall and I work with the state Auditor's Office of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I am going to leave the microphone for a minute to point to the area which I am going to speak about.

I am concerned with this very historic area, right out our front door [indicating on plan].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you identify the area for the record?

MS. MARSHALL: Yes. We are in the Quincy Market historical national registered district, and I come to praise a Caesar, really.

I think the plan of Secretary Salvucci and Governor Dukakis which is being reborn in this administration is a most praiseworthy one. But, as with any planning, the whole is made up of parts, and the part which is closest to my heart is one which has linkages to the architectural community in Boston, and that is in which we sit.

The historic fiber of Boston has always been closely linked the waterfront. The Central Artery, when it was constructed in '50 bisected that link, destroyed it, if you will.

We saw the rebirth of it with Ben Thompson's plans for the market in the '70's, and we are all enjoying both the financial fruits of that and the pleasure pursuits, if you will.

I am asking for an integrated approach to this transportation study before bricks and mortar go up on parcel B10, right outside Faneuil Marketplace. I beg for a reassessment by the BRA in cooperation with the State Department of Transportation for the use of that parcel. Perhaps the linkage that Boston has, as always historically for me, has a new chance for revival, and I plead for that both on the state level and the national level to the national advisory counsel on historic preservation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Miss Marshall.

Is Mr. Trombley or Mr. Anzone here?

Well, they are not here, so Robert McDonagh, the chief engineer for the Department of Public Works is going to take over this area for the

next hour or two or three. Mr. McDonagh?

MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you, Commissioner Tierney.

Maybe it would be a good time to restate a couple of the ground rules.

I will be calling the people who have preregistered to testify. If we have any gaps, people who have signed up here today will be called on to fill in those gaps. If you are reluctant to get up and testify, we will be delighted to receive a written statement from you. They may be addressed to the Department, my attention, I'm the chief engineer, Massachusetts DPW at 100 Nashua Street, Boston, 02114.

With that, I guess the next one on my list is Dave Porcaro. Mr. Porcaro?

MR. PORCARO: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. My name is David Porcaro, and I run a family-owned trucking company in East Boston established some 35 years ago at Logan Airport, called parochially: "Dave's Motor Transportation, Inc." I am here to discuss a very important and sometimes overlooked phase of Boston's Logan Airport, that is its air cargo community.

Dave's is the authorized cartage representa of Boston's airlines and some of Logan's major air freight forwarders, and we serve as the vital highway link between Logan Airport and New England's business community because we ser the entire region through Logan Airport, not ju the City of Boston.

For example, the cargo pick-up and delivery territory extends north to southern Maine, encompassing a great deal of New Hampshire, westerly through Worcester County, and as far south as Newport, Rhode Island.

In addition, Boston's Logan is considered b the airlines as a cargo hub; this means, basica that they support their aircraft from not only Boston and suburbia, but also depend on pre-loa containers from substations located as far away as Hartford, Connecticut, Manchester, New Hampshire, Portland, Maine, and Providence, Rho Island, in order to establish their essential load factors.

The New England business community has converted to air cargo as a necessary way of li More than 4,000 different companies in the regi

either ship or receive goods through Logan's cargo facilities. Industry has committed to air in order to reduce inventories and financing costs, as well as warehousing, insurance, and packing costs, in addition to the obvious time saved in transit.

In short, air cargo has enabled this region to compete in today's world marketplace.

Air cargo is a very time-sensitive commodity. Unlike a passenger, as we see O. J. Simpson in the ads, who can arrive at the jetport minutes before flight departure, cargo must be on hand up to two hours before scheduled aircraft departure. Minutes, in fact, do make a difference.

For example, the one-way toll Massport recently put into effect resulted in an overall fleet stem time reduction of some nine minutes per vehicle. This has already meant the difference in some cases of cargo being 5,000 miles away in a distant marketplace, the next morning rather than just sitting on the Boston loading docks. It was, in fact, a step in the right direction. We need more progressive thinking.

The Third Harbor Tunnel, the depressing of

the Artery, is a giant step towards assuring Logan's viability in the future.

Air freight has, in fact, been doubling eve five years, and indications are that the future of air cargo is bright and promising providing we can maintain our expediency, reliability, convenience and speed.

There are two major factors that have helpe spur this growth: One is that the European and Far Eastern markets, which are major producers of high value, low density goods, see air cargo as the fastest method to get their products to and from our technology-oriented New England markets. Secondly, up until now, we have had the vision to expand our airport resources to e the technological sophistication the airlines h brought about in air travel.

We are going to have to continue that visio if we want to keep pace with changing times. The existing Central Artery and the Sumner-Callahan Tunnels are the product of what I refe to as the propeller age and pre-dated today's interstate highway system.

The vision we need is to the jet age, reduc

transit times, easier and better access to New England's gateway to the world. We can ill afford further competitive disadvantages in the world marketplace by reducing Logan's access and its effectiveness.

We must be supportive of the Third Harbor Tunnel and depressing of the Central Artery so that the future interests of the City of Boston, the Commonwealth, and indeed all of New England are served.

Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Going back to the assignment list, I have listed Frank Trombley or Georgs Antone, are they here?

No, they are not. I will now call Mr. Weinberg from Massport?

MR. WEINBERG: My name is Robert M. Weinberg, I'm service chairman of the Massachusetts Port Authority. I'm not going to speak today, however, representing Massport. That role happens to be filled by David Davis who testified yesterday, and I certainly agree with the text of his comments.

Rather, I'm here as an observer since 1961 of the transportation planning process in the Boston

region.

For the last six years I have had a statutory seat on an obscure body called the Metropolitan Planning Association, which is federally required and coordinates federal investment in transportation improvement in this region.

I really have only two comments to make about the said plan before you.

First, is a comment really about government and the civil engineering profession. I think that there is an unbelievable achievement, even to have gotten to this point today, in the state Department of Public Works, the executive office of transportation and construction and the joint venture, they all should feel a great deal of pride in having produced an enormous amount of material in a very short time.

Secondly, and I want to state clearly this, that I favor the alternative 5A as modified. I think it is a remarkably creative set of solutions to a series of very difficult problems.

First, I think it correctly puts the Artery before the Tunnel in terms of priorities, that is to say, that it is clear that we have to have

Artery improvement if the whole system is to work better.

In the course of dealing with many constituencies that are effected by Logan Airport, we talk regularly with high tech. firms and many of the transportation managers in those firms tell us that increased Tunnel capacity alone will not solve their problem. I think, also, that the South Boston design with due interchanges in the most recent modification is a remarkably creative solution to a very difficult set of problems.

Finally, I think the Bird Island Flats alignment also moves and impacts the third harbor crossing from waterway communities, and I think that is, too, is a very creative solution to a very difficult set of problems.

Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. Weinberg.

I have time to put into the regular schedule another person signed up today, Mr. Richard Pierce, from the South Shore Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Pierce?

MR. PIERCE: Good afternoon. My name is Richard Pierce and I'm the public affairs manager

for the South Shore Chamber of Commerce, and I promise to present some brief remarks.

The Executive Committee of the South Shore Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of our 1400 member businesses, has unanimously endorsed, in principal, the proposed Third Harbor Tunnel and the depression of the Central Artery.

Transportation has always been a major issue on the South Shore, highlighted with goals relating to the improvement of the Southeast Expressway, water transportation, rail freight, and passenger service, mass transit, and local concerns such as the Fore River Bridge, Burgin Parkway, and Braintree Five Corners. All relate to improving both commuter and freight traffic in and out of Boston from the South Shore.

The benefits of your proposal as we see it are two-fold: First, congestion on the Artery going to and from the airport will be relieved, and this will favor the impact upon the three major accesses from the South Shore, the Southeast Expressway, the MBTA's Red Line, and the water transportation system.

Second, improved traffic flow will directly

help the future economic development of the South Shore, such as the North Quincy Business Park, downtown Quincy development, as well as other industrial and commercial sites in the South Shore.

It is essential that a consensus be reached on improving traffic conditions so as not to jeopardize federal funding.

Based on the information submitted to the chamber to date, we can speak in favor of the administration's proposal.

Respectfully submitted for the South Shore Chamber of Commerce, Richard C. Pierce, manager of public affairs.

Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you very much, Mr. Pierce.

We have here Mr. Driscoll, of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority, who has signed up to speak.

MR. DRISCOLL: My name is John T. Driscoll, chairman of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority.

I appear here today to favor the construction of a third harbor crossing and the depression of the Central Artery as portrayed in alternate 5A modified.

I think it is known to some of you that I have been involved in the study of the Third Harbor Tunnel and Artery crossings for perhaps as many years as anybody else in government and in the City of Boston.

I have been at the Turnpike Authority for 15 years, and during those years we have brought to the legislature on numerous occasions the issue of the third harbor crossing.

In 1968 we studied at the direction of the legislature and with the legislature's money, several offers in the 1968 study that we returned to the legislature, and once again recommended some 15 years ago in that study, that a third harbor crossing be built.

I am not as familiar with all of the details of a Central Artery depression because my field has not brought me to that. But, I certainly favor it.

If the funds are available through the Federal Highway Administration and through the Congress of the United States, a study that was done on the environmental impact, an environmental study that was completed to which that is a supplement, as I

understand it, and filed in December of '82, that was done under the auspices of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority and with the Department of Public Works.

I don't think it is a question of which of the alternatives is better than the other or whether or not I prefer one or have a prior offer here, but more important, as great citizens of this Commonwealth and of this city, representing the environmental agency, that this city should favor a third harbor crossing and also, if possible, depression of the third Central Artery. A couple of the industrial statistics that I would like to leave with your committee for their consideration is the fact that I have always said and I am always concerned about the issue of public safety at the airport and in the East Boston community and the communities to the north of Boston, and, if we were to have an air disaster at the peak hours, I think we would have trouble getting the emergency vehicles, police, fire and ambulance through our existing tunnels under our control in time to properly handle the emergency situations that could exist. And, to be sure, we

have had a few incidents at Logan Airport, but, very fortunately for all, I understand those incidents were at off-peak hours.

I think we have an absolute opportunity at this time to get the federal funding for both of these projects, and I would certainly hope that your committee would see fit to recommend to the federal government that they be built. Thank you, very much.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Chairman Driscoll.

The next speaker that I have listed here is George Vasquez, from the Fort Point Arts Community of South Boston.

MR. VASQUEZ: My name is George Vasquez, I am president of the Fort Point Arts Community, Incorporated, of South Boston. Our organization represents over 200 artists with studios in the Fort Point area of South Boston.

I would like to leave the mike to point out the area for a minute?

MR. McDONAGH: Don't wander too far so that we can still make a record of what you are saying.

MR. VASQUEZ: The area is the total land and buildings south of Fort Point Channel, that is

the area I'm referring to [indicating].

We are concerned about the potential impact of the proposed seaport access road and Third Harbor Tunnel alternatives on the Fort Point artists and other business and residential neighborhoods in South Boston.

There are many alternative alignments proposed in the draft EIS/EIR, and each alternative has positive and negative features. I will confine my comments to alternative 5A and alternative 5A modified since they directly impact upon your community.

Before addressing some of our specific issues, I'd like to underscore our support for the general concerns expressed by other South Boston community groups. Such concerns about the negative impact of alternative 5A and alternative 5A modified include: Increased truck and commuter traffic using local streets, air quality and noise, construction-related disruption, the location of a toll plaza in South Boston, repairs to the fourth street, Broadway and Summer Street buildings.

We also support the concept of job guarantees for neighborhood residents in South Boston.

Alternatives 5A and 5A modified would cut through the Fort Point Arts Community neighborhood and impact very directly on a building at 249-259 A Street. This building had recently been purchased by 35 low and moderate income artists and will be used as work/live studios. The ECTC is obligated to treat this building as a sensitive receptor for the purposes of projecting potential noise and vibration impact and identifying mitigating measures.

The next speaker, Joanne Hutherington, vice president of the 249 A Street Cooperative Corporation, will focus her comments on the specific impacts of alternative 5A and 5A modified. Our concerns about the potential impact of these alternatives on the Fort Point area are as follows.

Vent structures: We would like to see evidence that the exhaust from vent buildings will not increase air pollution in the areas adjacent to these facilities. We would like assurances that the community will be involved in the design review of the proposed vent structures, which we understand are about 85 feet in height. The vent structure in alternative 5A modified is too

close to 249-259 A Street, and should be located further to the east.

We would also like to see a cost/benefit analysis of alternative 5A versus 5A modified in terms of number and location of vent structures.

Pile driving: Construction-related impacts from pile driving or other significant noise generators should be identified along with methods for minimizing such impact. Construction-related noise and vibration can make life miserable for area artists, especially photographers who use vibration sensitive equipment.

Ramps: Northbound Congress Street off-ramps shown in alternative 5A modified should be kept covered as far to the east as possible.

Covered roadway: We would like to see the number of openings in the cut-and-cover tunnel to be kept to a minimum.

Construction schedule: Specific construction schedules should be prepared to indicate the duration of disruption caused by construction-related activities.

Traffic studies: Specific traffic projections for local streets in Fort Point, during and after

construction, should be prepared.

Open space: Land takings should provide opportunities for much-needed open space and pedestrian access along the Fort Point Channel.

Public transportation: Many of the Fort Point artists and other residents of Boston rely on public transportation. We are requesting that rapid transit or express bus service from South Station to the airport be considered as part of the plans.

One percent for art: We are requesting ECTC to determine how it will comply with the state requirement that 1 percent of state construction project budgets be used for artwork. We are requesting a commitment to use local South Boston artists.

Community participation: We would like to see a commitment to involve neighborhood groups in the design and construction planning process.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. Vasquez.

I now have David Robinson of 249 A Street Coop Corporation, but I understand someone else

is substituting for him, Joanne Hutherington?

MS. HUTHERINGTON: Mr. Chairman, David couldn't be here and I live at 249 A Street Cooperative Corporation, and I would like to address the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report.

Our building is located within about 45 feet of the proposed right of way of the alternative 5A and alternative 5A modified. We are obviously very concerned about the potential negative effects from these alternatives.

We have recently purchased a large, vacant mill building and are in the process of renovating the building into 35 work/live studios for low and moderate-income visual artists. We would now like to take a minute to point out where the building is.

Here is the building, here is the tunnel, here is one of the vents [indicating].

We will be using our studios for working and living 24 hours a day, and we are therefore particularly sensitive to noise, vibration, dirt and air pollution associated with the construction and development of the proposed seaport access

road. We agree that the Fort Point Arts Community, Incorporated, of South Boston, and I would like to focus on some of their concerns as they are related to our building.

It is clear that 249-259 A Street is a sensitive receptor, and we felt the EOTC should take the necessary steps to evaluate potential noise and vibration impact and describe measures to mitigate negative impacts.

We will be directly affected by the construction-related activities associated with alternative 5A and 5A modified. Months of noise, vibration, dirt and disruption is totally unacceptable. These activities could have an extremely negative effect on the working and living environment. We are also worried about long-term noise and vibration impacts from the seaport access road itself.

We are very concerned about the design and location of the right of way and the vent structures, especially the one shown in alternative modified. The Tunnel and vent structures should be located as far from our residential property as possible.

Vehicular and pedestrian access above A Str

must be maintained. We would like to see the proposed temporary detour road designed to avoid intersecting with A Street near our building. A temporary pedestrian bridge should be built over the Tunnel along the south side of A Street during the construction period. Access to the parking on Wormwood Street should also be maintained.

Also, one of our concerns is about the design of the northbound Congress Street off-ramp in alternative 5A modified. The roadway surface is too close to our building. Alternative 5A provides a much more acceptable solution to the location of this exit ramp.

Many of the key issues for us relate to specific design and construction features of the roadway and vent structure. We have been told that we will have an opportunity to be involved with these issues in the design phase of the project. However, in order to fully comment on the acceptability of the alternatives, many of these design and construction decisions need to be clarified during the environmental impact statement and reporting process. Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, ma'am. I think now have the time for someone else who has signed up to speak today. Michael Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR: For the record, my name is Michael Taylor, I live at 68 G Street, South Boston. I am a candidate for the Boston City Council, I believe the second district G, we will know the winner this week.

I come concerned about the opposition; I come only to comment.

I will send an extensive reply to the Board. My comments have to do with the process of information to the neighborhoods involving the impact of this Tunnel.

When the state came to South Boston, they came with all these maps [indicating]. In real it was clear to me that there was only one map that they were interested in, and that was 5A modified. So, to come with all the rest of the maps I think, unfortunately, confused and bewil most of the people at the meeting. They could focus on what was going to be the real concerns of themselves on this Tunnel expansion or Tunn addition. So, I think that the first step I

would strongly recommend to you is to go back to the communities affected by this decision, that is, the South End, East Boston and South Boston, and bring out only one map, and bring out some clarity to this situation for the community and be clear about the impacts, very clear about the impacts both positively and negatively that each of the particulars of this particular plan 5A modified have on this neighborhood. And, some of those particulars that I'm concerned about is the Dorchester Ave. extension, and impact that will have on traffic from the Broadway section in South Boston.

There is a Catholic high school, a public housing project, a large Catholic church right in that area. Again, in this particular opening of this Dorchester Ave. extension, it is to provide traffic to give quick and easy access to downtown, and should be reconsidered.

The fact is, this Tunnel opening of the third Tunnel would actually be in South Boston, and that is what most communities are unaware of. The issue of a new road coming right through the heart of South Boston again has to be looked at

in terms of its impact more closely than it has had to today.

The construction of ventilation locations at South Boston locations, again, was very unclear to the people of this community because of these different maps and plans. The issue of hazardous trucks, whether or not they will be able to travel on this truck route, was something again that wasn't clear. The issue of how many bridge closings would happen in South Boston and how long they would close for, again, wasn't very clear.

The final comment I want to make is that, over the past several months there has been a lot of talk about a lot of different plans affecting South Boston and one is the Edison Coal Conversion and the other is the expansion of the Fort Point Channel. And, now, there is this Third Harbor Tunnel. It bothers me to think that all three of those things would take place at the same time and the absolute traffic chaos that we are creating because of that, all that construction, I mean, you fix one piece of sidewalk, one piece of street in downtown Boston and you have a

traffic jam for several hours. If you are going to have the construction of a potential coal conversion situation, the construction of a Third Harbor Tunnel not too far from that, and the construction of all these different hotels or whatever particular buildings are taking place, all at the same time, that bothers me as to what impact it would have in the community in which I live and represent.

So, I think it is incumbent upon you to take the responsibility that you are asking us to live with, to go back out to the communities with one map, with a clear understanding of how it is going to impact that community, and be fair and clear and honest with the community and how it is going to affect them.

Again, like I said, I will outline the particular issues in a statement to you given to you on August 22nd, but I wanted to come here today and ask you to go back out to the communities and be fair.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. Taylor, and we will be pleased to have your off-the-record comments.

The next speaker I have scheduled is Thomas Vallely.

MR. VALLELY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, my name is Representative Thomas Vallely, I represent the eighth Suffolk district in the state legislature, some of which borders these maps that are on the walls.

First of all, I would like to say that I strongly support the direction that has been forged under the Dukakis administration regarding these proposals.

I represent a community that is very, very well aware of the impact of development, and the candidate that preceded me, Michael Taylor, I think, offered some very, very good suggestions of caution to this group. However, those of us who represent the Back Bay and Beacon Hill section in the past have understood that when private development takes place, that we are experiencing in our community now with the Hynes expansion, with proposals for a new New England Life building that connected the Four Seasons Hotel into the new transportation building, we

are very well aware of the impact that private development has.

I think the key to understand this is how do public developments such as the one we are debating here today interplay with that, and how can that interplay be used to solve the equation of development. And, I think that the outlines that I've seen of this proposal, that this is a terrific model of how a private investment, a public investment, that is, in the area of transportation, not only forges the new economy of Massachusetts as previous speakers have spoken to, not only solves the transportation problem that many of the previous speakers have addressed, but it also, I think, highlights how important it is that a community can benefit from good planning in that regard.

I think it showed wisdom of this group, and I testified here under the previous administration regarding the Leverett Circle connector. I believe that its proposal for keeping basically the status quo in that area is an excellent transportation policy.

I think that it protects the community that I

live in, it protects Storrow Drive from an overf it enhances the entrance to that road from Storrow Drive, and I believe that with the devel ment taking place in that area, that that was a judgment not to make that an exit, a major exit, which I think will prove and take off some of th pressures that we are seeing now.

We have some roads in Back Bay and Beacon Hill that 120 percent of traffic passes through right now, and we cannot afford to have more influence from Storrow Drive. Further, however, on the backside of the Back Bay, the access road I think will relieve some traffic there as well and perhaps would lead to some lessening of congestion in that downtown section.

Secondly, from an environmental point of vie Beacon Hill has not been a place where you could stroll through to Charlestown or to the North En because of the physical environment that was put there by steel. I think with the modifications that have been proposed, I believe that a new relationship between those communities will only add to the fabric of community life in Boston.

Finally, I would like to say one thing: I

have testified on a number of proposals ranging from very small community things to the nuclear freeze, and never have I had the opportunity to address this group with as much enthusiasm for long-term planning. It is something that never happens. No one looks this far ahead and shapes the policy of the public policies that governments will have to take to control our economy and our future, and it is with great enthusiasm that I support this administration's transportation policy, which I think is linked to the quality of life issues and the future economy of Massachusetts. I thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Representative Vallely, we appreciate your remarks.

I am going back to the list and I find that there was one omission here, Frank Trombley and/or George Ansone from the Bay State Bus Company, but I don't think they have appeared.

We will now take a short recess.

[Short recess taken.]

[Whereupon, at 3 o'clock p.m., the hearing was suspended.]

* * *

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, SS.

I, Linda C. O'Brien, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified within and for the Commonwealth of Massachuse do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript, pages through 118 inclusive, is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken on August 10, 1983, at Faneuil Hall, Boston, Massachusetts, to the best of my skill, knowledge and ability.

Certified Shorthand Reporter
and Notary Public

My Commission expires:
November 25, 1988

VOLUME: V
PAGES: 1 - 40
EXHIBITS: None

PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1983

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

FANEUIL HALL

BOSTON

Corridor Public Hearing for Central Artery, Interstate Route 93 and Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate Route 90 in Boston, Massachusetts

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

ROBERT T. TIERNEY
COMMISSIONER

MARTHA A. REARDON
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ELLEN M. DiGERONIMO
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

KENNETH E. KRUCKEMEYER
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

JANE F. GARVEY
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ROBERT J. McDONAGH
CHIEF ENGINEER

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

Proceedings

MR. McDONAGH: Can I have your attention? Can we reconvene. I understand that I have a couple of more people who wish to testify. This period of time from three to six is an open time without prescheduled speakers, and anyone who comes in who wishes to speak, if they would kindly sign up at the table with the young lady, we would be happy to hear your testimony.

The first one I have here is Frank Trombley.

MR. TROMBLEY: Thank you. My name is Frank Trombley, and I represent Trombley Motor Coach Service of North Andover, Brush Hill Transportation Company of Dedham, Plymouth and Brockton Street Railway of Plymouth, Gray Line of Marlboro, and Bay State Bus Company. I am also a president in the New England area for United Bus Owners of America, and I am taking the liberty to represent the American Bus Association because I don't believe they know this hearing is being held, but I will have a letter from them telling the committee that I am free to represent them.

I am in favor of the depressed artery and the Harbor Tunnel, and I want to state that every place I have been in the United States, in cities that were bigger, in cities that were smaller, during the rush

hour there was no problem either getting through the city or around the city, and I take for an example Quebec which has a terrific problem. Half of the city is 350 feet above the other half, and yet they have two beautiful expressways running east and west connecting with the roads coming in from north and south, and if they licked their problem I am sure we can lick ours.

Pontiac, Michigan, I went out and accepted delivery for seventeen buses in a one- or two-year span, left the plant between four and five o'clock every time I headed home and never was tied up in a traffic jam when I left Pontiac to get through Detroit which is north, so that I could come over 90 to get to Massachusetts.

Many times I have been through Chicago at various times of the day from trips out west and trips going to the west, and at no time did I have a problem getting around or through the city at rush hour.

That's all I have to say.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. Trombley. Written statements are perfectly acceptable, more than acceptable. They will become a part of the permanent record if they are submitted prior to August 22nd.

MR. TROMBLEY: August 22nd?

MR. McDONAGH: Yes, sir.

MR. TROMBLEY: Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: They should be mailed to me, Robert J. McDonagh, Chief Engineer of the Department. My name is some place on the brochure there. All that's important is the Chief Engineer, Mass. Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street.

MR. TROMBLEY: Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Yes, sir. The next speaker is Bethany Kendall.

MS. KENDALL: The Downtown Crossing Association is a private, nonprofit organization representing more than 175 businesses generally located within the central business district and concerned with the civic and economic development of the downtown area.

We are aware of the environmental impact statement on this project and our Board of Directors recently heard a presentation given by Undersecretary Matthew Coogan on these proposals. It is quite clear that some action will need to be taken to relieve traffic congestion in downtown Boston.

The Third Harbor Tunnel project appears straight forward and must be addressed and the Central Artery situation must be dealt with as well. The project's

various alternatives pose many complications as a traffic and transportation issue alone, and become further complex when reviewed in the context of economic impact and access to the business community, both real and perceived during the construction period.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce has brought together a distinguished group of business leaders and technical advisors to study the project. This task force on which the Downtown Crossing is represented, will release a report on the results of their study in the next week or so. We will review this material in conjunction with the information we have received to date and provide a position statement for the public record by the August 22 deadline.

The resolution of this issue is of utmost importance to our downtown business district and I thank you for the opportunity to speak briefly this afternoon and to submit a written statement at a later date.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you. This period from three to six is walking in and speaking time. I am assuming that we have no one going to speak at the moment. We will have a brief intermission.

(Recess.)

MR. McDONAGH: Can we reconvene? This is the

hearing on the traffic environmental impact statement report for the Central Artery project and the tunnel project. Today from three to six we have open time, and anyone that comes in and signs up we will be happy to have them speak, record their statements, and it will become part of the permanent record from which the final decision will be made.

I understand that we have some people signed up. Patricia Loheed.

MS. LOHEED: Patricia Loheed, president of the Boston Society of Landscape Architects. I represent approximately 250 practicing landscape architects. In general our group wishes to support the concept of a depressed Central Artery and the third Harbor Tunnel.

We do anticipate areas for further study. These include careful consideration for the impact to the emerging waterfronts of Boston downtown, particularly, Fort Point Channel and the mouth of the Cherles River Basin, North Station area. We do not see that landscape architects were extensively included in the work groups reviewing plans as were members of the Boston Society of Architects and various engineering skills. We feel a more balanced approach to our profession should be included in a more active role. We also feel

that the configuration of the buildings should be carefully studied and favor integration with mixed-use building development or landscape and park development. We are concerned with the narrowing of the Fort Point Channel, the projected filling in of the South Bay area, the options where Dorchester Avenue is an open car route. It is my hope that the traffic through residential streets will not be generated by the proposed development.

Thank you.

MR. McDONAGH: Next I have signed up Phylis Charleton, President of Residents Association, Merchantile Wharf Building.

MS. CHARLETON: I would like to ask a few questions that really haven't been addressed. You are asking the people to be subjected to eight years of noise pollution and air pollution. The air pollution is going to be digging. You are going to have trucks coming in with dirt and clay and it is going to go all through the North End, eight years of this. There is going to be traffic congestion with extra trucks even though you are allowing for a lane of traffic just for the trucks.

After eight years you are saying we are going to

get twenty acres of land. Who is going to be able to live on this land? The people on the North End? They can't afford to live here now. They are slowly being forced out, and the B.R.A. is setting restrictions on it.

The people in my area don't want this expressway. For eight years you are asking people to be unmercively subjected to this. You are saying that this is the solution. This is the solution for people who don't live right here so they can get in and out of the City, but you are asking people who live there to suffer for it, and we are against it a hundred percent, and that's all I have to say.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, ma'am. The next person I have signed up is Robert Snowber.

MR. SNOWBER: I am Robert Snowber and I am a professional engineer with 35 years of experience in transportation planning and design. I am also chairman of the Transportation Committee of the South Shore Chamber of Commerce and a representative of the Chamber is going to be here at another part of the hearing today to represent their viewpoint, so I am here more as a private citizan and as a professional engineer.

The vital role that our transportation system

plays in the whole region's economy and standard of living is really undisputed. We have a good highway system and it should be better. We have a good transit system that should be better and we have a railroad system that is vitally in need of drastic improvement from the private sector, but it's well recognized that if a transportation system is not functioning adequately the economy of the region does not function adequately, and as much as we have invested in our transportation systems over the centuries, we really have never caught up.

The proposal to build a third harbor crossing and to depress and widen the Central Artery is something that we support and is an idea that demands that it be done as quickly as possible within the realm of reasonable financing. The project should move forward but it should move forward in a way that would reduce the negative impacts of both the tunnel, the approaches and the Central Artery depression so that the negative impacts can be minimized.

I would suggest these three particular items require very detailed attention even more than they already have received during the subsequent design and construction stage. First of all, the construction

stage be worked out on a community-wide basis in a way that will minimize disruption of traffic, pedestrian movements and goods movements. Secondly, the maximum use be provided in the design so that after the project is completed the Fort Point Channel can remain as a public waterway and be enhanced for its use by the general public, by the boating community, and its commercial activity can be increased.

Thirdly, during the ten-year construction period --and it might go more than tan years--an aggressive program be developed to encourage people to use public transportation, specifically by increasing service on public transportation routes, both buses, rapid transit, computer rail that serve the corridor; secondly, that a program of reduced feres be considered in order to make this public transportation more attractive; and, thirdly, that a much more aggressive use of park and ride facilities by people north and south on 93 and the other major corridors that serve the downtown so that the number of vehicles passing, coming into the downtown area and passing through the downtown area would be minimized.

One very important aspect of the project is its financing, $2.2 billion. That is one large amount of money. It's by an order of magnitude larger than anything

we have done so far. It's got to be recognized that Boston has to stand in line and compete with other metropolitan regions of the country.

One aspect of the program, namely, the third harbor crossing, has the opportunity of some secondary financing that should he taken advantage of, and what I am suggesting is that since the third Harbor Tunnel is really an extension of the Mass. Turnpike, that the Mass. Turnpike toll revenues for the entire system be pledged to underwrite the cost of the third Harbor crossing. It is not unusual that a regional transportation system be used to finance something like this, and I would refer to the New York Port Authority of New York and New Jersey who operate the major Hudson River crossing, the tunnel, George Washington Bridge as well as the three major airports and bus terminals and the transit system. They are using excess funds from the tolls on all of these facilities to finance commuter rail improvements, parking facilities in suburban areas and improvements to rapid transit throughout the region, so there is a precedent for it.

I would expect that this would need the approval of the bond holders and perhaps some refinancing on the part of the Turnpike, but as a natural source of revenues

that very definitely should be optimized to support it.

In closing I would just like to say that while the cost of $2.2 billion is a bit overwhelming, the cost of not building both facilities can be even greater.

Thank you very much.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you. I have a person who signed up to speak, Mr. John McDonough.

MR. McDONOUGH: My name is John A. McDonough. My address is 31 Milk Street, Boston, Massachusetts. I am a director of operations of four affiliated bus companies, Brockton Street Railway Company in Plymouth, Massachusetts, Brush Hill Transportation Company, McGinn Bus Company of Lynn, Massachusetts and North Shore Bus Company in Wakefield, Massachusetts.

I am here in support of both these projects, and in regard to the utilization of our buses and the efficiency of our buses in moving through the City of Boston, as all four carriers are authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission as well as the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities to perform charters and on a daily basis, we utilize these expressways. Specifically I would like to address my comments to Plymouth and Brockton Street Railway Company. They are the largest privately owned commuter carrier in New

England. We presently carry approximately four thousand people from the South Shore, the Cape, the Brockton and Milford areas to and from the City of Boston Monday through Friday. Plymouth and Brockton also operates an airport service whereby we pick up passengers as far south as Hyannis up to Hingham, Massachusetts and transport them into the City of Boston and then onward to Logan Airport. The fuel waste would be a fantastic savings in regards to another tunnel crossing to the airport. Our buses presently can leave Hyannis and be in approximately an hour and 45 minutes leaving the City of Boston in a non-commuter hour. Those buses can take anywhere from thirty minutes to another hour and a half to get to Logan Airport. We believe that as far as Plymouth and Brockton are concerned that the third approach to the airport would be a fantastic savings to Plymouth and Brockton in a selfish way but that we would greatly increase the amount of passengers that we would carry from the south shore and Cape Cod area to Logan Airport.

We realize that at the present time in the drive that they would be stuck behind our bus as well as the fact that our bus is stuck in the tunnel or on the expressway, but we firmly believe in the marketing

research that we've done that fast approach to Logan Airport whereby we do not get involved with the expresaway and the tunnels, present tunnels, would remove additional traffic off the highway and would get passengers from Plymouth and Brockton to and from Logan Airport.

MR. McDONAGH: Thank you, Mr. McDonough.

I will say once again that three to six is open time for people who want to speak. You do not have to be signed up. Give your name to the young ladies at the door.

Having no more signatures here, we will take another brief intermission.

(Recess.)

MR. SHERLOCK (Frank Sherlock): I want to reopen this public hearing after the recess. Some folks have signed up and would like to be heard. I want to remind everybody that we have a sign-up sheet in the front of the hall, and if you want to be heard please identify yourself for the young ladies there and you will have an opportunity to be heard.

Pat Wells is the next person to be heard.

MS. WELLS: My name is Pat Wells and I am speaking on behalf of the Boston Educational Marine

Exchange, and I would like to give our comments to the third Harbor Tunnel widening and depressed Central Artery.

The Boston Educational Marine Exchange objects to the adverse impact of the Third Harbor Tunnel/Widened and Depressed Central Artery plan on the Fort Point Channel. The Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately consider the value of the Channel itself and its potential to fill important recreational, tourism, marine commerce and water transportation needs of Boston and Massachusetts. Nor has the Environmental Impact Statement adequately considered alternative transportation modes including ferry service which, taken together, could considerably ease traffic on existing roadways.

A surface roadway along any portion of the downtown Channel edge is objectionable and would be inimical to recreational use. One would think that with the downtown portion of the Southeast Expressway (Central Artery) staring us in the face that this would be generally realized.

The Environmental Impact Statement has not taken into account potential use of the Channel as a downtown harbor for boats with the attendant recreational and

development activities and tourist dollars to be gained from such a waterfront attraction. The City lacks docking and other facilities for boats. The Fort Point Channel, a "harbor of refuge" at the core of downtown, is a logical place for boats and, in fact, has been designated for this use in the City's plan for the Harbor.

As proposed by the Boston Educational Marine Exchange, the Channel could accomodate as many as 1500 boats, with a possible 600 power boats above the Summer Street Bridge. Public lands, ramps, water taxi terminals, a breakwater/pier for visiting tall ships and cruise ships, a promenade along the Channel edge with attendant cafes, restaurants and other amenities are all part of this exciting proposal. (See accompanying poster.)

Next year the Tall Ships will visit Boston and, again, there will be no place for them downtown. In addition, the Antigua and Classic Boat Regatta, a new annual event, anticipates 100 boats. Where will we put them? For two years now the Fort Point Channel has provided the site for a brave new boat show. There is no question that boating events are popular with the public; they also enrich the coffers of the city and its merchants. There is no reason why, in the future, a

marine oriented Channel couldn't be as big a draw (or bigger) than Annapolis or Newport--both multi-million dollar affairs.

The EIS has not sufficiently addressed impacts on the marine recreational use of the Channel nor the question of revenue accruing to the City from such development. Per boat spending on restaurants, supplies, recreational shopping and the like would amount to considerable in a season, as would income the City would reap in property taxes from marina assessments.

Annapolis and Newport have turned private pleasure boating into by far their major economic activity. Any EIS on the Tunnel/Artery should certainly look at potential revenue that would be generated by a recreational boating complex in the Fort Point Channel.

The EIS has not covered impacts on the Channel's potential use as a water transportation arm to the new South Station Transportation Center. Streamlined water-buses similar to those used so effectively in Amsterdam could fit under the bridges and call at a South Station landing at the foot of Summer Street to speed passengers to Logan Airport, North Station and other harborfront destinations. This would also help alleviate traffic downtown.

The question of density of projected development in the Dewey Square/Fort Point Channel area and the need for the breathing space a Channel recreational area could provide needs to be considered.

A surface roadway, so-called "New Dorchester Avenue" in the Tunnel/Artery plan, along the edge of the Channel is antithetical to recreational use of the Channel. Who wants to promenade along a highway or, for that matter, sit on a boat dock beside rushing cars. This would also be a deterent to sidewalk cafes and other commercial recreational development along the waterfront. A classic mistake cities have come to regret is putting roadways along their waterfronts.

Alternative transportation measures to ease traffic congestion have not been looked at in the EIS and need to be before a decision on the Tunnel/Artery is made. Area boat operators are eager to run ferry service from the South Shore to downtown and Logan; all they are waiting for are the landings. Massport is willing to provide a landing at Logan. The City is requiring the developer of Rowes Wharf to provide a ferry terminal. A landing in the Channel could make the AMTRAK and bus station connection. Ferries with connector bus links, revived train service along the Old

Colony Line, improved T service, park and ride, subscription bus services, van-pool could all act to alleviate traffic from south of Boston into and through downtown. In fact, the process of finding alternative ways is already underway in part due to the impetus of the Southeast Expressway reconstruction.

Time and time again, grandiose building plans have become obsolete scarce they have been completed. There is a need for the EIS to project its vision and imagination into the future. 12 years from now, the anticipated completion date of the Tunnel/Artery project, use of the private car in the city may be on the wane with totally different forms of people movers taking its place.

The Fort Point Channel offers a dramatic opportunity to reintroduce a rich variety of marine activities of a contemporary nature at the very heart of downtown Boston. Tunnel/Artery impacts on this potential need to be thoroughly examined before a decision is made.

Thank you.

MR. SHERLOCK: Thank you, ma'am. I would like to remind everyone that those of you who would like to make a statement and do not feel comfortable about making it

orally can present us with written documents here at this hearing or to the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, Boston, Massachusetts, addressed to the Chief Engineer. Up to August 22nd these will be included in the public hearing record.

I would like to call on Martin Nee.

MR. NEE: Good afternoon. For the record my name is Martin Nee, legislative aide to Representative Michael Flaherty, South Boston, and I have a letter here addressed to Secretary Hoyte from Representative Flaherty that I would like to read.

"Dear Mr. Secretary: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the latest supplement to the Dreft Environmental Impact Report on the Third Harbor Tunnel, Seaport Access Road Alignment.

At this point in time, I do not feel that one can make a responsible decision for, or against, the various proposals, as many issues of community concern have not adequately been addressed.

Specific matters of concern have been raised at numerous meetings, both public and private, which to date have not received a definite answer.

For example, alternative 5A modified was originally designed to alleviate much of the truck traffic

which now overflows into the neighborhood streets of South Boston. Yet, it is not known whether this alignment could accomodate the several hundred petroleum container trucks now based in this portion of South Boston.

Given the present status of the proposal, I would venture to say that the situation regarding hazardous cargo does not look promising. If an undertaking of this magnitude will not resolve the problem, can we ever expect to remove these heavy trucks from our crowded side streets? The latest alignment of 5A also raises questions regarding the placement of toll booths within the waterfront section of South Boston. Although it is stated in the report that traffic queues in the area will have no effect on air quality, it is my contention that the over-all impact of traffic congestion at the tolls would be significant.

In addition, no definite decision has been reached, to my knowledge, as to the exact placement of ventilation stacks in South Boston. These huge structures undoubtedly create adverse impact on air quality and land use in surrounding areas.

In fairness to the communities which will be severely effected by the lengthy construction phase of

any alternative, I feel that a strong commitment to provide jobs for residents first should be forthcoming. A guarantee of this nature is crucial to my ultimate acceptance of a seaport access alignment.

In closing, Mr. Secretary, I would emphasize that I will reserve my judgment on any proposal until firm commitments can be reached in regard to container truck traffic, toll booths, air quality and land use impacts, and resident quotas for construction job hiring.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to express my views on this important issue.

With kind regards, I am

Michael J. Flaherty, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary."

MR. SHERLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Nee. The next speaker is Joseph Tuzzolo.

MR. TUZZOLO: Good evening. I am Joseph Tuzzolo. I represent Braman, Dow and Company. I am the treasurer of the corporation and I am here to speak on behalf of our concern in referance to depressing the artery.

Braman, Dow and Company is located at 239 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass. We have been in business

since 1848 and located at the present address of 239 Causeway Street since 1904. We have an approximate customer base of 2,300 accounts serving all of the New England, six-state area, various parts of the United States, including several international accounts.

Our prime source or product is distributors of pipe, valves and fittings for industrial, power plants, hospitals, utilities in metropolitan Boston and surrounding cities and towns. Currently we employ at this location, 239 Causeway Street, approximately forty people. Ten percent of them are residenta of the City of Boston, forty percent north of the City of Boston, forty percent south of the City, and ten percent representative of east and west of the City. We do provide parking at Braman, Dow for approximately 25 to 30 parking spaces for employees and customers parking on its property. The entrance to this parking is by use of Traverse Street.

Inventory and storage. At this location we inventory various sizes of pipe in random langths of twenty feet and forty feet. All inventory is delivered by our suppliers by use of flatbed trailers entering at Traverse Street, at the Traverse Street entrance. Incoming material/inventory handling is accomplished by

using a ten thousand pound capacity forklift for off loading trucks and storage within the company property alongside the Central Artery.

Deliveries are made daily using two fifteen-ton rack body trucks, twenty-two feet in overall cargo length, and three smaller pickup trucks along with the company station wagons.

Customer pickup. Many of our industrial and institutional customers and utilities require daily pickup of purchased pipe, valves and fittings and do so by using our Traverse Street entrance. Again, this enables our material handling equipment to load customers' trucks directly from our supplies of various pipe stored on our land next to the Central Artery.

We respectfully submit before this hearing this evening, the following topics concerning the impact and disruption to Braman, Dow and Company, Inc., daily business operation during the actual depression of the Central Artery and removal of the existing elevated artery:

A. Employee Parking: We estimate that we provide 25 to 30 parking spaces for our employees and customers who commute. The balance of employees either use car pools or Mass. Transit.

Question: Our understanding is that a slurry wall will be constructed some 20 feet from the existing artery for the depressed artery. Will this eliminate all our parking on our property for employees since we abut the current central artery? If yes, can you provide our employees with comparable safe, without cost, parking within a reasonable distance from our location?

B. Invantory Storage/Handling: Since a large percentage of our inventory is located on our property, stored in racks and sized accordingly, Question:

1. Will the slurry wall reduce our access to our driveway, our property, and material storage area abutting the current central artery?

2. Will our weekly deliveries of pipe and related inventory items via trucks, flatbed and box (40 ft. trailers) have access to our Traverse Street entrance?

3. Taking all of the above in account, will our material handling equipment have free access without restriction of travel on our property to off load all deliveries?

4. Will the Federal or State provide for temporary storage and warehousing during construction and fund this cost during the entire construction period?

C. Deliveries: Currently our warehouse and

distribution center is located at 239 Causeway Street, utilizing an 80,000 sq. ft. capacity to service our customers and branch warehouse in Scarborough, Maine.

Question:

1. Since our warehouse ships and loads all materials from our rear docks, which abut the existing central artery, will all vehicles have access to our loading docks and material handling equipment?

2. Will the Federal Government provide funding for warehousing during construction and all additional cost of material handling related to disruption during related construction?

D. Customer/Pickup: Materials ordered by customers to be picked up at our shipping dock, rear of 239 Causeway Street (entrance by Traveree Street).

Question:

1. Will our customers have full access to our driveway, Traverse Street, and will we have the room to load trucks via material handling equipment?

2. Because of the construction impact, customers who under normal conditions pick up material ordered, will require delivery by us to their location. This will result in additional operating costs both in required vehicles and personnel. Will the Federal/State government

provide funding to defray all additional cost labor and equipment during construction?

When reviewing various brochures supplied as to actual construction, we are concerned about the following:

Question: When the artery has been depressed and the existing artery removed, new or reconstructed roadway systems will be constructed. Will this new surface roadway take any of our parking and or storage capacity currently existing?

While we recognize the need for improved transportation and the obsolescence of the Central Artery, our prime concern must be the welfare of our business, its owners, customers and employees; a business that has continuously operated in the City of Boston for some 135 years. We require assurances and commitments that any disruption to our normal business operations, directly or indirectly, caused by the depression of the Central Artery will be fully compensated by the State and/or Federal governments.

Thank you.

MR. SHERLOCK: Jonathan Berg, please.

MR. BERG: Good afternoon. For the record my name is Jonathan Berg and I am a resident of 12 Glenrock

Avenue in Malden. I am here today in the capacity as a private citizen, not as a member of any special interest group or community organization. I have decided to come here today to speak to the hearing because I was a former resident of Cheuncey Street in Harverd Square, and I, along with thousands of other Cambridge individuals, experienced the last major construction project that was undertaken by the State, and that was the Red Line extension. I was driven, as many of us were, from the Harverd Squere area because of the noise and dust pollution.

The previous administration had proposed the third Harbor Tunnel and in doing so had gone against all the wishes of the communities of East Boston and the North End, and I am quite surprised that this administration who had rejected the idea almost eight years ago has come up with it again.

To expend $2.2 billion at a time when the present infrastructure of highways, bridges and water and sewer systems are in a sad state of disrepair to me is economic insanity. I just want to put a couple of remarks on the record from letters that I have before me. One is from Mr. Gary. He outlines in his letter the history of the Central Artery and also outlines the

history of its demise. I will take one sentence here. I am quoting. "The artery is far exceeding its capacity with 160,000 cars per day using the road and traffic projections of a ten percent increase over twenty years. This aging and overburdened structure will have to be rebuilt or replaced within the next ten years in order to keep the route operational."

This was said 25 years ago when the original Central Artery was proposed, and we had a plan devised and we had a large construction project undertaken, and the net result today, some 25 years later, is the existing mess we have.

I think that $2.2 billion would be better expended in solving all the major bridge and highway problems that we face.

Now, I also want to direct a comment to the letter of Christine Marr in which she outlines basically that the project can create five thousand construction jobs and nearly ten thousand permanent jobs, and she talks about keeping the unemployment rate in Massachusetts below the national average, but nowhere among either of these two statements or, quite frankly, among the reports that I just looked at here briefly is the impact of a minimum of $200 million commitment from

this State to fund this project. There have been many alternatives and one alternative to the third Harbor Tunnel is a three-step proposal, and I will outline it for you.

One is restriction of all limousines to and from the airport, hackney limousines, the creation of a ferry system from the airport to the new South Station terminal with all hackney and limousine service for the south and west shore stemming from that point, and thirdly, restrict the use of the Callahan Tunnel to commercial, to private passenger use for the airport.

In closing I just would like to reiterate that the environmental impact upon the communities of the North End and East Boston will be devastating by either one of these proposals, and the economic impact upon the citizens of Massachusetts will also be devastating because someone is going to have to come up with $2.2 billion to fund this project, whether it is through local taxes or federal taxes, and I think at the bottom line of this we are looking at the same situation down the road in twenty years.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHERLOCK: Thank you, Mr. Berg, for your comments.

This hearing is going to continue and will continue until eleven o'clock p.m. this evening. We would like your comments at this time, as this is free access time. You don't need a reservation. If there are no persons in the audience at the moment who want to make a statement, I am going to declare a recess.

(Recess.)

MR. SHERLOCK: I would like to reconvene the hearing, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. TERRELL: My name is Kenneth Terrell, 140 Wollaston Avenue, Cambridge. My address will concern itself not as much with the third Harbor Tunnel per se but mainly the Central Artery depression and its possible side effects.

The depressing of the Central Artery in itself is an excellent idea. The noise factor will go down markedly, making the entire affected area a nicer place to live and work. It should be noted here that the artery was only built the way it was for one reason and that was to clear the then existing Orange line elevated rapid transit tracks at North Station and again at City Square station. Since the L is no longer there, there is no good reason or excuse not to follow through on the project. However, there is one important

ingredient missing from this latest proposal that distresses me.

In the original plans which I saw nearly ten years ago there was another major artery which was to be included in the depression scheme. It was to benefit the many thousands who do not wish to drive or go through downtown Boston, and I would be against any proposal that did not include this important ingredient. The important factor that was included in the original plan stated that there was to be a two-track commuter rail connector linking North Station and South Station for runthrough service that was to operate down the center of the roadway much as the Chicago Transit Authority's rapid transit lines go down the middle of the Kennedy Eisenhower and Dan Ryan expressways.

Under benefits and effectiveness, with the gigantic South Station Transportation Center on the horizon this will be an essential step to a coordinated public transportation system that will also benefit the motorist. It will make the commuter rail system more efficient and cheaper to operate through the benefits of runthrough operation. A train coming in from say Stoughton will come into South Station and would then continue right through to North Station and continue to

Ipswich. The effect that you obtain is that you cover two runs with one set of equipment; hence, the fuel consumption of one diesel not two, with the payroll of one crew, not two. It would also help to cut down deadhead mileage for equipment on the south side when servicing is needed. An additional benefit to this scheme would be Amtrak which could through-route some of its trains from New York up to Bangor, Maine and possibly Montreal, giving Greyhound, Trailways and Vermont Transit Lines some competition to the monopoly they have in northern New England intercity ground transportation.

The present North Station could be leveled and a new arena could be built in the void. This would render North Station to a second-class status such as Back Bay station is on the south side. If desired, an intermediate stop could be added at State and Atlantic connecting with the Blue Line and serving the Aquarium and outer fringe of the financial district. It would also be the first rail connection between the two rail terminals since the cessation of Atlantic Avenue el service in September of 1938. Travel time between the two hasn't been the same since. This should be of prime interest to the Dukakis administration as they before, as now, are on the record as strong public transit

advocates. The benefits of such a scheme will be felt this fall in Philadelphia as a commuter rail connector will open between the Reading terminal and the 30th Street Penn Central station there. The major difference is that they built theirs without a road.

Our last beneficiary of this Central Artery scheme would be motorists in other areas of the state. We have a major problem with bridges around the state, many of which are on secondary roads which traverse rivers, streams, railroad tracks, et cetera. It is also a well-known fact that replacing them is a monumental task in respect to both time and money. Not much can be done about the time factor, but there is a way to lessen the financial burden.

The longitudinal steel beam members used in the present Central Artery if disassembled properly could be used again in other areas. For example, if an 80-foot span needs replacement on a secondary road bridge, two or three 100 girders can be taken from the Central Artery, cut down and used in the reconstruction. Remember that this is steel used to carry tremendous loads daily. Putting such steel to use on a bridge that may carry less than one thousand cars a day would render such a bridge practically indestructable. Such

steel could possibly be used even on a large span such as that on Alewife Brook Parkway near Pinge Avenue.

So I would urge that the State Department of Transportation and the Highway Department take a serious look at what I have stated here. All citizens, not just those driving on the Central Artery, must benefit from this project if it is to be a viable and effective entity in the City of Boston and its environs into the year 2000 and beyond.

Thank you.

MR. SHERLOCK: Nina Meyer.

MS. MEYER: My name is Nina Meyer. I am a resident of Boston and I live in the North End and I am an architectural historian and I direct the Historic Neighborhoods Foundation which teaches the architectural history of Boston.

As a resident and as an educator I am really concerned about the quality of life in the City. I feel very strongly that this is a walking city and that the decisions that are being made right now I am afraid are being made from the point of view of traffic rather than people. I feel this is a terrible mistake and that we should go back to what Boston was in the past rather then try somehow to keep forcing it into some vision of

a way that it could have been if it had been laid over with a bunch of highways at some point in the past fifty years and lost all of its native character.

You are wondering what my position is on this. My position is very clear. I think that if you do build this tunnel coming in from the Central Artery to the airport, that's a very good idea if you close the other two tunnels. I don't think anyone else has proposed that. I think that those two tunnels are disrupting life in East Boston for an entire generation. The neighborhood of East Boston has been cut in half by those tunnels and has suffered terribly, terribly, and I really think that there is no reason why you couldn't close those two tunnels and direct all your traffic for this one new tunnel which you are going to get all your money from the federal government, and it's a powerful argument. It's a power argument. It's nice to use that money. Why not? That's a good opportunity.

So that's one suggestion as far as the Central Artery.

My fear is that I think that you shouldn't be blinded on the other hand and that I think you should think very seriously about what we really need, and that is to have more of a physical connection to the airport

that we could have on the water. The harbor has been ignored. We used to have a ferry system. We used to be able to take a ferry to East Boston for a nickel and it worked very well for a great many years.

What you really want to have is a ferry. That's number one, as many ferries as might be necessary from Charlestown to Long Wharf from Thompson Island among all the different islands. Secondly, I think you should improve the subway system and make it as sexy as the Washington, D.C. subway system. It's a marvelous place. People go to it, it's a tourist attraction. It is clean, it is modern, it is safe, it is great, and you could make a fabulous subway connection between the airport and downtown, and then that would take care of that.

Third of all, I truly know you must all know that it isn't going to solve Boston's so-called traffic problems when you add this tunnel. It simply isn't. All you are going to do is to attract more cars because you have got what everyone thinks is another access to the airport, and then they are just going to all get choked up some place else, which I think some of the more expert testimonies have been telling you.

So from the point of view of the local person,

the person who teaches, who lives in Boston and has walked to work and has no use for a car, a great many people in Boston are in the same position. All you are doing is serving the transitory population. You should keep them out of the City, close down the other two tunnels, open up this new one.

Now, my other testimony that I want to give you is very briefly for the Central Artery. I wish that you could do that overnight. I truly do, but you can't, and twelve years is a very long time in the life of a person. I have been working downtown where they have been building skyscrapers. Every time we move our office there is another skyscraper going up in that corner, and it is very unpleasant and hard to get anything done. The telephone systems have continuously been destroyed. My office is on South Street by the skyscraper at Dewey Square. I can't even imagine what kind of havoc you are going to have as a result of this really Herculean task, and I urge you to try to come up with some better plans than you have now. These vague plans of nothing will be hurt and the North End will be fine, Quincy Market will be fine, I just feel that you have got a hell of a job ahead of you and I hate to see you go ahead with an environmental impact

statement that was rushed through and doesn't have a lot of the problems solved at all.

I think we would all like to see the artery disappear by magic but you can't do that, and so I simply urge you to be cautious and not do anything that would really hurt the neighborhood.

Thank you.

MR. SHERLOCK: Thank you. It is now six o'clock, and between six and nine we have preregistered speakers. I would like at this moment to declare a temporary recess.

(Recess.)

Certificate

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Middlesex, ss.

I, Cynthia C. Henderson, Registered Professional Reporter/Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing record, Pages 1 through 39, inclusive, is a complete and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes taken in the above-entitled matter.

Cynthia C. Henderson
RPR/CSR and Notary Public

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.

VOLUME: VI
PAGES: 106
EXHIBITS: None

PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1983

6:30 PM

FANEUIL HALL
BOSTON

Corridor Public Hearing for Central Artery, Interstate Route 93 and Third Harbor Tunnel, Interstate Route 90 in Boston, Massachusetts.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

ROBERT T. TIERNEY
COMMISSIONER

MARTHA A. REARDON
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ELLEN M. DiGERONIMO
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

KENNETH E. KRUCKEMEYER
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

JANE F. GARVEY
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

ROBERT J. McDONAGH
CHIEF ENGINEER

ROBERT H. LANGE ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
50 CONGRESS STREET
BOSTON, MASS. 02109
TEL 523-1874

PROCEEDINGS

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: It's 6:30. I just wanted to chack and see whether anyone who is signed-up who has not yet spoken is here to speak.

Larry Rucki was signed-up to speak at 6:10. Sheriff Dennis Kearney was signed-up at 6:20, although the sheet here says he will send in hie testimony. 6:30, Andreas Sarzana.

Okay. We'll stay in recese then for the moment until someone comae with a prepared spooch.

(At this time, a recess wae taken.)

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: It's 6:43. I thought I would just check and sea whether any people who were signed-up to speak in this hour are here before we re-open the hearing for recess.

People who were signed-up as speakers: at 6:10, Larry Rucki; 6:20, Sheriff Dennis Kearney; 6:30, Aodreas Sarzana; 6:40, Maria Bova.

We'll stay off the retord for a moment.

(Dietueeion off the record.)

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Mr. Virgilio, would you like to be heard?

MR. VIRGILIO: Yes.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Okay. Let ma call it back

to order.

My name is Kenneth Kruckemeyer, Associate Commissioner of the Mass. DPW and chairing the meeting of the Publit Hearing.

There are several announcements that I think should be read into the record for the moment at the beginning of thie segment.

We're calling on speakers who have asked to testify in the order that they have signed-up. Anyone eleo who would like to speak is certainly welcome to do so. They should leave their name et the deek so that we will be ablo to call on them in order. We welcome any written statements or comments as well, and they can be turned in either at the sign-in table or sent by August 22 to Robert MtDonagh, Chief Engineer of the Mass. DPW, 100 Nashua Street, Boston.

If anyone has any questions, there are techni-cal staff to anewer them. We have maps to the side, front, and back; and if thare is any information that you peopls will nead to have about the location and benefits, that's also available here.

We now have Virgil Virgilio. Would you like to give your testimony?

MR. VIRGILIO: As far as the Artery is conterned,

it's been an eyesore as far ae I'm concernad; and I'm a property owner in the North End. I've lived there most of my life.

I feal that in theory, what was supposed to be dona is a vary good idea. Most of the people more or lese worried about property being taken; and as long as tho property is not going to bo taken, then I'm I00 percent for what is suppoeed to happen.

There is mora of a traffit problem now with the Artery; and during the tonstruttion, I don't see too much of a problem as far ae basitally what we have thera now.

It kind of puts a barrior batween what we have as far as the North End is contarnad and tha rest of Boston, as far as batwaen that sagnant of the North End and the Haymarket Square, North Station, and just kind of just cuts it acrose. If wa tan put it under tho ground, I think it ie a batter idea; but as long as none of tho proparty is touched, that is probably tho major iseue in tha North End right now.

I've bean haaring a lot of proe and cons ae far as the Artery; but from what I've rsad, from the information I've been given, no proparty is supposed to be touched. Certain businesees will ba affected probably;

and I think it is a sacrifite that some of the peopls are going to hava to make to bettsr tha area, to better the traffit problem that they have now. At 5:00, 6:00, they're cutting through certain streete to get around that, anyway. They're coming down ona-way streats. They bump into each other.

So, if wa can solve a problem like that by straightening something like that out, I'm for it; but, again, ae long as none of the property is touched and a lot of the people who have lived there for many years are not bothered, then I'm all for it.

Noiee, conetruction, trutke; that's all part of tonstruction. Whethar it's digging up the streete to put new pavement, new sidewalke, any lighting, that's all part of construction.

I hope that it doee go through and what I've read and what I've been given information on ie kept the way it's supposad to be. Then I feel that it ie a 100 parcent very good idea. It will not only tlean up the area, but it will make it look very nice. It can only help tha North End to keep the value of the property in that area much higher, much neater, and much less noisier if sverything is done the way it's supposed to be done.

So, I just want to say, in essence, it's a very good idea. I am 100 percent behind it; and I hope that it does work out and that the community will open up their eyes as far as -- they're misled as far as what properties are going to be touched and what isn't going to be touched. I hope most of the people can understand that property will not be touched; and I'll be the first one to come back here and say I was wrong if the property is touched. Believe me.

So, I just want to say yes, I am for it; and as being a resident down there for many years, you have my support as long as none of the housing is touched and the elderly people are not bothered.

I guess as far as noise is concerned and traffic, it's part of the sacrifice I think we should make; and there is nothing much more to say other than we shall see.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you.

I would like to reiterate that we do have information about property, acquisition, and all of the edges of the property as it relates to existing buildings and where the new construction is going to take place or is projected to take place.

So, anyone who wants to know anything about

a specific building can, by reference to the maps that are here, know more details in talking with the consultants that are here as well.

MR. VIRGILIO: Well, you have to show more or less what's showed.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Right.

MR. VIRGILIO: Okay.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you very much.

Let me go back and call the names of people who had signed-up during the 6:00 hour and see if anybody else has come who has not yet spoken.

Larry Rucki. Sheriff Dennis Kearney. Andreas Sarzana. Marie Bova.

Martin Forgione.

MR. FORGIONE: My name is Martin Forgione. I live at 406 Frankfurt Street, East Boston.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: East Boston? Could you repeat that again.

MR. FORGIONE: My name is Martin Forgione. I live at 406 Frankfurt Street in East Boston. I live in the Neptune North section.

I just want to ask a question. What I want to know is: what happens to the increased traffic after it leaves the airport headed on north on CI?

My concern is that 20,000 cars per day increase will require a change in the roadway between Neptune Road and Bell Circle. That's where I live, and that's where a lot of people live. I want to know what's going to happen.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: There are two ways of getting answers.

The best way of getting a detailed answer is to speak directly with someone here. If there is no one here that can answer that very specific question --

MR. FORGIONE: Could I ask you: has any study been made in reference to what I just said?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: It's my understanding that detailed traffic projections have been made; and your question, if I understand it correctly, is: how is this, the additional traffic, to be handled on exactly what roadway; is that correct?

MR. FORGIONE: Well, I'd like to find out how it's going to affect where I live, because is my house going to be taken over by eminant domain? Are people going to put a road right through my house? How are you going to handle the traffic?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: The plans on the wall are intended to show specifically where a roadway would be

built and whether your house would be affected directly or not.

MR. FORGIONE: I just took a look at the map; and as far as I can see -- I'm not a good map reader, but I don't see anything on that map beyond -- well, it's vague to me where your study ends. I can't see any that makes it clear to me.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Okay. Can I first refer you to -- have you talked yet with Anthony Casendino?

MR. FORGIONE: Yes, I have.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Is this off of the maps that we have here in the room? Is the location that you're asking about completely off of the maps that are in this room?

MR. FORGIONE: Well, I looked at the maps Tony showed me. I don't see anything related to my land. It stops at a certain point, and that's it.

Now, if you have 50 percent increase in traffic coming out of the airport, coming into my area, you're going to have to do something about it. What you're going to do is what I want to find out.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: It sounds to me that if it's not possible to answer your question here in the room tonight, we will have to do that in responses to

the testimony so that the answer is clear and part of the final --

MR. FORGIONE: Do you see what I'm getting at?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: I'm not sure that I do. I'm sorry.

MR. FORGIONE: Well, can I go up to the map and show you?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Sure.

MR. FORGIONE: See, the map stops here. I live here (indicating).

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Okay. Your location is beyond the edge of the map?

MR. FORGIONE: I'm near the first exit at Neptune. It will not only affect me if you have a 20,000 car per day increase -- it will not only effect me, but it will affect that whole area.

How are you going to handle all that traffic that's alleviated from this area, goes into this area, and comes out here?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Are you saying that traffic, by virtue of going into the Third Harbor Tunnel rather than through the two existing tunnels, will be in a different location as to your house?

MR. FORGIONE: You're confusing me.

It can alleviate the traffic from the two tunnels. All right; one tunnel, and it's going to come to this tunnel. Now, it's going to increase here by passing the first section of East Boston; but you're going to have, as I understand it, a 20,000 car per day increase coming out behind the park and into CI. It's only a two-lane passage now. I would assume that you're going to have to make some changes.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: If the traffic projections and the analysis of the lane widths in existence there now are not capable of handling the traffic, I could understand your problem.

However, it's my belief, in my view of the documents, that the roadway, CI, as it goes north of the airport --

MR. FORGIONE: Not from the airport; in the opposite direction. I'm talking north of CI, Bell Circle.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Going north from the airport?

MR. FORGIONE: Not from the airport exit.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Okay. I don't see a way of really answering the question in this large meeting between us. The best thing I can do is either refer you

to the consultants who are here in the room tonight or to promise that an answer will be included as part of the Environmental Analysis.

MR. FORGIONE: But you say you have already or will have some sort of a study?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: The study has been done, which will determine --

MR. FORGIONE: Well, I'm asking you if the study has been done, what does it tell me?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Okay. Can you hold on just a second?

As I understand it from one of the consultants, the information does not exist in the --

MR. FORGIONE: Then a study has not been made; right?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: I can't say that. Apparently, the information doesn't exist right at the moment here in this room.

MR. FORGIONE: Does it exist or doesn't?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: I can't answer that question. What I can do is promise you that the answer --

MR. FORGIONE: I think you have answered my question. There is no study made. You've stopped at that point, and you haven't gone beyond that; and I

would assume that if you have an increase in traffic, you're going to have to change that roadway somehow.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: What I have to say is that we will promise to give you an answer as part of our statement so that it is clear to you that you will have your answer.

MR. FORGIONE: I can't see how you're going through all this problem and stop short at CI without making a study of seeing how it will effect it from that point to Bell Circle, the land on the North Shore. How can you just stop it at that point?

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you.

Okay. We can take one other person who is from the floor, Paul Curtis; and then we have signed-up speakers starting at 7:00.

Yes.

MR. CURTIS: My name is Paul Curtis. I'm a resident of 13 Dwight Street in the South End.

I would like to address the issue of traffic on East Berkeley Street now, not to mention the projected increase in traffic on that street that will inevitably result from the plans for the Third Harbor Tunnel.

I live there now. I'm an architect. I am an architect for numerous residential conversions along

that street or in the process.

As we sit here, the responses of the City, the Redevelopment Authority -- it may not look at it as a residential street, and those residents are right on the sidewalk; bedrooms and living rooms. Right now as we speak, every morning there are flows of traffic, heavy trucks. It's an extremely noisy situation. I don't know that there is, as we now speak, any alternative route into downtown Boston; but what is happening there is that the residential nature of that street has not decreased, but it's increased.

The street is lined with Boston Redevelopment Authority parcels. Various groups are putting requests for use of portions of these parcels; and their requests are to use them for residential purposes.

So, it is not going to be lessened. It is going to be increased. It seems to me that if there is any alternative to increasing traffic on that street, it should be seriously looked at because it's a narrow road. It cannot be widened without demolishing buildings that are not occupied and presumably increasing taxes.

The cars and the trucks aren't going to go slower, and they're not going to go more quieter. Right

now, it's the main access into the Back Bay just from the expressway alone in that area. To increase it is just going to increase the real noise and pollution problem there, and that problem exists certainly all up until close to rush hour.

Obviously, it's not an out-street. You know, about 5:00, our problems finish and other problems begin; but if there are alternatives to increasing the traffic, it should seriously be looked into, and I believe there are alternatives to put the traffic more into an area that is occupied essentially by markets, industrial buildings, and buildings that don't have windows within five feet of the traffic.

I mean, there are no buffer zones even discussed on that street. That's where people are sleeping and living, and we are sponsoring rehabilitation business. We are sponsoring the creation of new buildings in those lots right now. The lots are very small. I am sure anybody building there is going to have to build right up to the lot line. There is no way to put any kind of buffers that exist in Castle Square because there are a certain number of gardens. I don't know how much good that does that. I believe they're here this evening to discuss it.

But it's a residential street. Whether that was the intention of the plan or not does not matter. The point is: as a result of private initiative and City policy for the past three years, that street is becoming more residential, less industrial, and presumably will continue to do so. To increase traffic is to fly absolutely in the face of that.

Thank you.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Curtis.

Clark Frazier.

MR. FRAZIER: My name is Clark Fratier. I live at 38 Dwight Street in the South End. I'm a member of the South End Committee on Transportation and should note parenthatically that I'm Chairman of the Boston Air Pollution Commission.

Before I start on the South End piece, I just want to note for the record that there is no necessity for replacing spaces displayed by the depression of the Central Artery in downtown. In any case, the replacement of those spaces will be regulated by agencies such as the Air Pollution Control Commission; and if there is a replacement of spaces for the Artery because there will be parking limited when the construction goes on, absolute priority should be given to the business

use and resident use for the North End.

It should not be long-term parking for commuters being replaced. If anything, the amount of parking for the commuters should be reduced as the capacity of the road system is reduced.

Now, the South End. I think it's fair to say that the people in the South End are generally supportive of the depression of Central Artery and are willing to listen to a Third Harbor Tunnel, given that there be more evidence coming in. However, we cannot support either of these projects unless the ramps are moved from Berkeley Street to Herald Street.

The existing levels of traffic coming in on East Berkeley Street and trying to go outbound on Herald Street, but not being able to do so and therefore using interior streets in the South End, such as Dartmouth, Clarendon, Waltham, etc., has created a situation where any road in the highway system passing, whether it be rebuilding the Southeast Expressway, depressing the Artery, resurfing the Artery, building the tunnel -- doing anything is going to cause more traffic in the South End simply because of the development of the Back Bay, if nothing else. Therefore, we must have a project to move the ramps to Herald Street.

That is a major problem. The City has had a long-standing project on its books to make a two-way extension of Herald Street as far as Berkeley and possibly Clarendon Street; and it should be noted that the ramps, for any relative improvement/changes, should be designated accordingly.

There are some secondary problems. The Mass. Avenue Interchange is three lanes southbound, which would create a bottleneck; and there are also left-handed access ramps. That roadway configuration forces traffic into the South End following the Albany Street route.

I think that sort of summarizes what the major problems are. I have some photographs. I'm not quite sure how to get those into the record.

I think what I'll do is: I have the photographs numbered; and I will make a statement about each numbered photograph and put that in the record, if that's okay.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: You'll be submitting the photographs as part of your testimony?

MR. FRAZIER: Yes. It will take me a minute.

I'll let you look at the photographs. I'm also submitting in the record an article I wrote, a piece of the South End News; and a letter about

Metropolitan District Commissioner William T. Geary asking that the project for upgrading Herald Street be started.

Let me comment on the photographs by numbers, and I will give you the photographs or a copy of the photographs which are numbered.

The first photograph is of Foley -- I call it "The West Canton Street Wall." It shows the relationship of the South End to the developing Back Bay. Unfortunately, traffic trying to get to the Back Bay and the expressway between the Back Bay and the expressway system is trying to use South End streets.

The second photograph is taken of East Berkeley Street at station 4, and it shows that even off-peak traffic clogs the intersection of East Berkeley Street and Tremont Street.

Photograph No. 3 is Dartmouth Street; and that shows clearly that it is a narrow residential street which is clearly inadequate to handle traffic flows from a project such as Copley Place and other developments.

Photograph No. 4 is a photograph of Herald Street and Albany Street taken from Harrison Avenue. It shows the open area to the right of Herald Street that can be used between Harrison and Albany available

for widening.

It's important to note that this piece of Herald Street between Harrison Avenue and Albany Street, and taking part of the Herald and whatever they call themselves, the Herald parking lot should be included within the Central Artery and Third Harbor Tunnel project because this area will have to be disrupted by construction.

Photograph No. 5 is Herald Street and Albany Street with bus turning, and it shows how constricted that intersection is. Note that there is a large, clear area to the right of the intersection to be used for expansion of the road surface under the expressway without moving the buildings.

Photograph No. 6 is Albany Street and Herald Street, and it shows the difficult turn onto Albany Street.

It also should be noted that the expressway system opposite the South End is really very ugly and that any efforts that can be made to reconstruct, change, widen, narrow, reconfigure would take into account the fact that the existing structure is really ugly and has a very depressing effect in the area.

Photograph No. 8 is East Berkeley Street --

I'm sorry.

Photograph No. 7 is Albany Street from Herald. It shows a difficult access to the southbound expressway on-ramp.

One of the problems that we currently have is the southbound Berkeley Street on-ramp is actually intended to be served by Herald Street since Berkeley Street is not and will never be two-way, and it's such a difficult access that the traffic goes through the South End.

Photograph No. 8 is East Berkeley Street southbound on-ramp. This ramp is one block too far south. Traffic sneaks through the South End, goes under the ramp pictured using the loop south of East Berkeley Street, and avoids the traffic lights on Herald Street, which are five, and one on Albany Street.

Photograph No. 9, Southeast Expressway; bridge over East Berkeley Street. The existing bridge there has only three traffic lanes southbound, no shoulder.

Photograph No. 10, southbound East Berkeley Street off-ramp. This ramp duplicates the ramp one block north of the next to Herald and Albany.

Photograph No. 11, southbound East Berkeley Street off-ramp. Note poor geometry and vehicle conflicts

shown in photograph.

Photograph No. 12, northbound East Berkeley Street on-ramp. This ramp duplicates a ramp one block north.

Photograph No. 13, Fort Point Channel. I took this for the record to show the area that will be filled in by this project. Access from the South End on the Fort Point Channel was blocked in 1951 by the construction of the expressway.

Photograph No. 14 is a picture of the left-handed Mass. Ave. northbound on-ramp. This ramp is dangerous and will be a serious hazard for trucks trying to go from Lancaster Boulevard into the seaport access road in the Harbor Tunnel.

That ends my testimony. Following will be a number of South End neighborhood groups.

I ask that the neighborhood groups themselves scheduled not take the full ten minutes. There are other South End residents who would like to testify within this hour. I would appreciate it if we could have them and try to stay within the hour and in as a group.

Thank you.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you, Mr. Frazier.

The next person who I have signed-up is Mr. Robert Harkness, South End Historical Society.

MR. HARKNESS: I live at 131 Appleton Street in the South End.

I'm here tonight as a director of the South End Historical Society, and I don't intend to take the full ten minutes. I would just like to read a one-page lettsr which was sent today under the signature of President Susan Park to James A. Walsh and Robert McDonagh.

"Gentlemen:

"The South End Historical Society fully supports the proposed depression of the Centrsl Artery.

"The South End Historical Society tentatively supports the proposed Third Harbor Tunnel Plan 5a, provided that the following additional changes are made in the street and trsffic patterns to preserve the residential nature of the South End, which is the largest extent Victorian residential neighborhood in the United States:"

These changes are: "1. Herald Street should be the only traffic route between the Back Bay and the Third Harbor Tunnel and the Southeast Expressway and it should replace East Berkeley Street as the chief

access route to the Back Bay from the Southeast Expressway. The access ramps to the Southeast Expressway should be restructured accordingly.

"2. Access to the Southeast Expressway at Berkeley Street should be sliminated to make it impossible to enter the Southeast Exprossway by driving through the South End.

"3. The Massachusetts Avenue interchange should be restructured to provide four lanes of south-bound traffic and edequate truck access between Roxbury and South Boston.

"The South End Historical Society believes that these tbree changes in the traffic patterns ere essential to prevent the proposed Third Harbor Tunnel from inadvertently congesting the South End with commuter traffic and illegal parking."

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Ken Gritter will be the next speaker.

MRS. GRITTER: As you can see, I am not Ken Gritter. I'm actually Carolyn Gritter. I live at 32 Chandler Street in the South End. I'm the chairman of the Ellis Neighborhood Association, Inc., and I would be speaking instead of Ken Gritter, who is chairman of our Planning Development Committee.

In ths interest of time, I will just read a portion of our statement since it really echoes what Mr. Frazier has already said. The fact is that the issue of the East Berkeley Street ramps impacts our neighborhood, particularly since Berkeley street runs right through the Ellis neighborhood. So we would be vitally interested in seeing a reduction in traffic on that street.

We are more particularly concerned that both the draft EIS/EIR and the Supplement fail to include existing and future traffic volumes on local South End streets in the analyses of the impacts of the various tunnel alignments and the Central Artery depression.

Specifically, the Cobble Place Environmental Impact Statement snd new traffic studies for the St. James project; a proposed 1,100 spece to 1,500 space garage on the Ten City side and the traffic remifications from the new Back Bay station when it comes ought to be considered in aggregate es contributing to traffic in our neighborhood.

So that, from our point of view, it's important that a build alternative, including reconstruction of the Central Artery, would be contingent upon eliminating the north and south on- and off-ramps from the

Southeast Expressway et East Berkeley Streat, repiecing them with southbound remps at Heraid Street, end constructing a widened two-way Herald Street with e northbound Back Bay connection to serva Berkeiey, Clerendon and Dertmouth Streets. An upgreded two-wey Heraid Street above the reiiroed to Berkeley Street wouid mitigate the impects of e decision to go forwerd witb a third tunnel and depress the Centrel Artery.

A plan to improve the level of treffic servica to the city should not, as e consequence, creete an increased flow of vebicles on local South End streats. We, therefore, urge that the aforementioned ramp rearrangement and Hereld Street improvemants be incorporated into the planning for e third tunnel and e depressed Centrel Artery.

I'm speeking for the Board of the Ellis Neigbborhood Associetion. Thank you.

MR. KRUCKMEYER: Thank you, Mrs. Gritter.

The next person who is signed-up is Peul Buddenhagen, Union Perk Associetion.

MR. BUDDENHAGEN: My name is Peul Buddenhagen from the Union Perk Associetion.

Besicelly, I do not heve e prepered statement but wouid simply like to reiterete some of the concerns

that heve been expressed: in particuiar, one, the lerge volume of treffic on Berkeley Street and also the lerge volume of treffic on Dartmouth Street and Union Park Street, West Dedham Street and Ciarendon Street.

Basicaily, we, as an association, wouid support proposed pians to depress the Centrel Artery and to buiid a Third Harbor Tunnei provided that it in no way works to increase the voiume of traffic on East Berkeley Street and on the side streets in tha South End.

It's our view that shifting traffic from East Berkeiey Street to Herald Street would significently aiieviate probiems in that regerd. Tharefore, we wouid favor that specific proposei in terms of the Third Harbor Tunnel and the residences.

Other than -- no more comments.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you.

Lydie Welshin, H Street Association.

FROM THE FLOOR: They're not here.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: They're not here. Okey.

Linda Uichak, Bredford Shewmut Association.

MS. ULCHAK: My name is Linde Ulchek, and I'm here ss e resident and president of the Bradford Shewmut Associetion.

We support the depression and expansion of

the Centrel Artery and the creetion of a Third Herbor Tunnei, with the condition thet the East Berkeley Street ramp be redesigned and reloceted to Heraid Street.

As e life-iong resident of Bredford Street and very invoived in the many issues facing the Bradford-Shawmut Neigbborhood, which is bordered by Weshington Street, East Berkeley, Tremont Street, and Union Perk, issues and concerns which ere shared by many of the South End neighborhoods. The Bredford-Sbewmut Neighborhood, along witb abutting residential communities, have been the recipients of urban renewel planning and funding. As a result, the City hee inveeted millione of dollars for the plenning and impiementetion of cepitel improvements to turn e deceying and blighted area into one that the City can be proud of and thet wa, the residents, have choeen for our homes.

We want to bring to your ettention the fragility of our urban reeidentiel neighborhoods thet have been undergoing change for the peet few decades. With the more recent development projects end interest in downtown and the Beck Bey, ss well ae devalopment within our own neighborhoods, South End communities are constantiy experiencing the pressures and consequences of development activity.

Our residentiel side streets heve served as short-cuts to commuters cutting across town. Washington Street, Weltham Street, and East Berkeley in our immediete neighborhood heve served as mein thoroughfarss through our neighborboods for commuting treffic entering and exiting the City. We heve worked with the City to changa treffic petterns, including changing street directions for vebicuier use and aitering timing mechanisms in treffic lights, to discourage use of our neighborhood streets for commuter traffic. These changes have been made, often at great inconvenience to our own residents, but alweys with the purpose and goei of discoureging the use of our streets as short-cuts and mein thoroughfares for commuting treffic.

Recently, we've sean the proiiferation of parking lot proposels for verious parcels of land within our communities. Our residentiel communities heve opposed these proposals ae uses tbet are inepproprieta, not pert of the urban renewal pians and commitment for the reviteiiization of the South End, not the highest and best use of the land, and not at ail sensitive to urban residentiel neighborhoods.

The remp at East Berkeiey Street with the increased teffic from the expanded Centrei Artery and

the Third Harbor Tunnel will seriously add to an already intolerable situation and will adversely impact the quality of life of many city neighborhoods. The redesign and relocation of the East Berkeley Street ramp to Herald Street for the protection and preservation of South End neighborhoods must now be addressed.

Thank you for your concern and we look forward to working with you in the weeks and months ahead.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Ulchak.

That concludes the people who have signed-up prior to the hearing; and we have a list of people who are here to speak from the South End, if you would like to continue.

I'd like to first call Susan Straight.

MS. STRAIGHT: My name is Susan Straight, and I live at 31 Milford Street in the H Street neighborhood of the South End.

Ten years ago, people living in the South End worked together to design an overall traffic plan for the area. Out of it came the new Tremont Street and Columbus Avenue reconstruction, which is in process; many one-way street changes; and a general scheme to keep the South End a residential neighborhood rather than

a commuter link between the Back Bay and the Southeast Expressway.

The South End today has not changed its view of keeping the neighborhood intact. In fact, it is all the more imperative due to the growth of business in the Back Bay/Copley Square area.

An integral part of the original South End transportation plan was the construction of a new two-way Herald Street which would focus traffic on the periferry of the South End and de-emphesize Berkeley Street, thus alleviating the problem of commuter traffic on residential streets. It's important that any Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project connect to this new road and support rather than hamper the overall South End plans.

What is available with the project is the opportunity to solve many long-standing transportation problems, and it would be foolish to lose the opportunity by not coordinating the effort with existing plans.

The effects of this project will be felt for many decades, and it's important to make sure that a depressed Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project works for the people who live in Boston as well as those who drive through Boston.

The South End will oppose any plans for the

Artery and the tunnel if those plans cannot be altered to interface with the overall South End transportation plan and to help solve the problems rather than to create new ones.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Straight.

The next person to speak is Anna Taft.

MS. TAFT: My name is Anne Taft. I'm a resident of Dwight Street, 29 Dwight Street in the South End. My house is bordered upon Berkeley Street.

I am a member of the H Street Neighborhood Association; and also, I've been very involved in the Berkeley Street garden on Berkeley Street between Shawmut and Tremont.

I just want to express that I agree with the other speakers, and I'm concerned about the level of traffic presently on Berkeley Street; and we wish that egress from the tunnel would not -- could be placed in a way that the traffic would not be increased and hopefully decrease in our area.

Many of the gardeners across Berkeley Street -- the Castle Square area is very severely affected by traffic as well as our side of Dwight Street.

Thank you.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you, Ms. Taft.

The next person to speak is Louis Peltier.

MR. PELTIER: I am a resident of the H Street Neighborhood Association. My address is 37 Dwight Street, and I'm on the odd side of Dwight Street, which means my house, as I look out the window in the back, faces East Berkeley Street where everybody is talking about.

Now, if you were home having breakfast with me tomorrow and looked out the window at about 8:00, you would notice that there is a congestion of traffic on Dwight Street as people come off the expressway coming into Boston from work; and I can attest, as a resident, that when the heavy concrete trucks pass by my window, I don't only see them, but I feel them.

I think that if the traffic on Dwight Street were to increase by any significant amount, the road, as it stands, wouldn't adequately handle the traffic and my breakfast wouldn't be as digestable as it has been over the years.

Also, I'd like to focus in on the fact that plans for the Orange Line coming down are about 87 -- they're talking about 87; and they talk about possibly an LRV or increased bus traffic on Washington Street; and I believe that if you did a traffic count, as I expect that you probably will or have done, that with

any increase in traffic on Washington Street, that the corner of East Berkeley and Washington Street will be a potentially hazardous area as the two roads which are perpendicular come together. I would anticipate increased traffic with the increased traffic from the bus line or LRV.

I'd also like you to consider the fact that in that immediate neighborhood, because there is a good deal of traffic on East Berkeley Street and because the S Square projects back right up to East Berkeley Street for that one block, that there could very well be potentially environmental problems with this increased traffic.

I'd like you to consider the fact that we've already received comments from various horticulture societies that are telling us we can't eat the plants in our victory garden because of the traffic going up East Berkeley Street, and the increased traffic would be additionally environmentally impacted.

I've given up my victory garden. I plan to plant in my back yard. So, in addition to the victory garden, the plants in my back yard will be impacted.

I really don't think that we should have any increased traffic there, and I would like to go on

record in that regard.

Now, Mr. Walter from the H Street Neighborhood Association is not here, one of the planned speakers this evening, as you probably noticed. I'm a dues-paying member; and I can say for the record that the H Street Association, along with most of the testimony that was given this evening, that we are opposed to increased traffic on Berkeley Street as a result of that.

Thank you.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you.

Marsha Myers.

MS. MYERS: My name is Marsha Myers, and I'm executive Director of the Boston Landmarks Commission.

I would like to read a letter addressed to the Department of Public Works.

"Dear Commissioner Tierney:

"Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel project.

"The Boston Landmarks Commission is sympathetic to the goals of this project and commends the Secretary of Transportation and the project team for exploring alternatives which would attempt to minimize disruption of the Central Business District and residential

neighborhoods while upgrading the regional transportation system.

"The Landmarks Commission, as the City of Boston's agency concerned with the preservation and enhancement of the city's historic resources, has reviewed the draft EIS, including the supplemental report dated June, 1985, in order to assess the potential impacts of the historic resources of the City.

"The overriding concern which has emerged from this review pertains to the potentially devastating impact of the 'build' alternatives for the Fort Point Channel.

"The channel is the last remnant of the water body that defined the old Shawmut Peninsula. With the gradual filling in of the South Bay, a process which would continue under this project, the channel becomes even more important as a vestige of that feature. The channel, its bridges and the older commercial buildings flanking the channel have been identified as a district potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. While the channel has, for many years, been neglected, it nonetheless represents an important visual and recreational resource for the City, as well as a link with its past.

"In general, the Boston Landmarks Commission opposes the use of the channel for roadway purposes - whether for the Third Harbor Crossing, the Central Artery or for Dorchester Avenue. The Commission's specific concerns regarding the channel are as follows (in rough order of priority):

"1. Reduction in the absolute and visual dimensions of the channel by construction which narrows, shortens or spans it. (Narrowing and spanning activities being more objectionable than shortening its length.)

"2. Intrusion of street level traffic between the channel and the headland.

"3. Reconstruction of historic bridges resulting in loss of original fabric as well as disruption of symmetry in design when constructed.

"Removal, replacement, or visually obscuring the historic bulkhead.

"Removal of the Old Colony Bridge.

"Taking of buildings in the South Boston Industrial area and to vent buildings near the existing Northern Avenue Bridge.

"Of the 'build' alternatives currently under consideration, Alternative 5a is the least disruptive with respect to the Fort Point Channel. Alternatives

3, 3e, and 5 are the most objectionable.

"The Commission is disturbed to see the re-introduction of a new Dorchester Avenue connaction in Alternative 5e modified. It seems particularly unfortunate that, if this connection is important, it must be re-established outside of the old alignment and the old bulkhead.

"The Boston Landmarks Commission has no objection per se to the concept of a third harbor crossing, seaport access road or depression of the Central Artery. There are many and varied benefits to be accrued by these projects. However, the Commission must state its opposition to the aspects of these projects which would adversely affect the Fort Point Channel and other historic resources, unless these negative impacts can be reduced or mitigated. The Commission would like to see the following:

"1. Adoption by the Mass. DPW and Federal Highway of design solutions which would minimize the narrowing or shortening of the channel. Such solutions would include use of part or all of the old Dorchester Avenue alignment or Atlantic Avenue for northbound artery traffic.

"2. Elimination of ramps crossing the channel.

"3. Elimination of a new Dorchester Avenue connection.

"4. Public access, appropriate landscaping, and provision of water-related activities along the channel edge.

"5. Mitigation of the negative impacts by positive actions aimed at improving the environment of the channel. Such measures might include facilities to improve water quality in the channel and redesign of the Northern Avenue Bridge to allow full access by pleasure crafts and working boats.

"6. A process for continued review of more detailed plans for the treatment of the channel, its bridges and bulkhead.

"With respect to impacts on resources other than the Fort Point Channel, the Commission would like to see" -- these pertain to Alternatives 3a, 5a, and 6.

"1. A process for anticipating and monitoring construction impacts on historic resources adjacent to the Central Artery, and a plan for shoring and stabilizing such properties in the event of anticipated or unanticipated damage.

"2. A process for continued review of the

location and design of vent buildings, new highway ramps and new surface streets adjacent to historic properties and other development on parcels to be created. This can be handled through the Advisory Council procedures established pursuant to Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

"We look forward to continued discussions with the Executive Office of Transportation concerning this project and measures to reduce its negative impacts on the city's historic resources.

"Hershe Myers."

I must also add that while this is somewhat beyond the purview of the Landmarks Commission to comment on, we nonetheless are sympathetic to the concerns expressed by the South End residents affecting the South End, which is a district listed in the National Register of Historic Places; and therefore, I would like to support personally the Herald Street improvements.

MR. KRUCKEMEYER: Thank you.

We'd like to call a two-minute recess.

(At this time, a recess was taken.)

MR. TIERNEY: I'd like to reconvene the hearing.

My name is Robert Tierney. I'm the Commissioner

of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works, and we will resume where Associate Commissioner Kruckemeyer left off.

We have a person who signed-up at 7:40, Lydia Welshin; and if she is here, she can speak. If she is not here, we will go to the --

MR. STERZI: I represent Lydia Walshin.

MR. TIERNEY: What?

MR. STERZI: I'm the replacement for Lydia Welshin.

Hello. My name is Dennis Sterzi, past president of the Association, which is formed by Tremont Street, Shawmut Avenue, and Berkeley Street and Waltham Street.

MR. TIERNEY: It would help me, I think, if you had the microphone closer to your mouth. Move the mike closer.

Okay.

MR. STERZI: I would like to go on record as opposed to the Berkeley on- and off-ramps and would prefer the Herald Street exits. This would reduce the amount of traffic that is already very heavy in the neighborhood.

I cross Berkeley Street every day to take my children to day care, and it's quite difficult with two

children crossing trsffic on Barkeley Streat.

I think tha proposal of removing the traffic via Herald Strset is a viabla alternative becausa thara is no naighborhood as such on Herald Street.

MR. TIERNEY: Put tha mika up. It will halp me.

Okay. Tha acoustics are lousy. Forgive me, but they are.

MR. STERZI: That's it.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you. What's your nama again?

MR. STERZI: Dennis Starzi.

MR. TIERNEY: Our next speaker who was pre-registered was Alfred Penta.

Our next speaker who is registered this evening is Fernando Requena.

MR. REQUENA: My nama is Fernando Raquena. I am the presidant of the Worcester Square Area Association in the South End.

I hava four specific points I want to address in regards to tha project that wa ara commanting on tonight. Tha first ona was talkad about at langth by a previous speakar, and it's with referanca to tha access to the Fort Point Channal.

At tha present tima, I don't think any of the altsrnatives proposes enough access to Fort Point Channel for the recreational activities, which has great potential. There have been already several points that hava been proposad for the redevelopmant of the channel for the use of the citizens of Boston and, obviously, of the South End.

I believe that this should ba carefully studied so that the access to the Fort Point Channel for recreational activities remains at least as much as it is now and, if possibla, enhancad by the project. I would utterly give my support to tha proposals of the Landmarks Commission in this regard.

The second point that I want to address is that noise impact. It has baen advocated in the impact statement that the noise impact would be minimal for construction activitias and other activitiss after the construction completion. However, I believe that the airport expansion, which is an obvious -- it's going to ba an obvious off-shoot of the Third Harbor Tunnel -- it's going to sventually produce grsatar aircraft traffic and, consaquantly, a greatsr amount of noise in our naighborhoods.

I believe tha Massport should consider this

as being a very difficult thing to live with and that the South End has had its shara of noisa and wa would like it to be less rather than more.

Even though this seams to ba a fringa impact, it's a secondary impact that you should not ba neglecting; and if the airport's going to be expanded as a consaquanca of the Third Harbor Tunnal, I baliava that the modus oparandi of the airpnrt should be studied in some other ways that taka-off should ba carriad out.

Tha third point I want to addraas is tha accaas on exits to tha Central Artery from Massachusatts Avanua. As the Central Artary will becoma a mnra enticing way of getting north, mora traffic will ba coming through Massachusatts Avenua.

Massachusatts Avenua is on tha edge of my neighborhood association, and it has baan hiatorically a rasidential streat. At tha prasant tima, howavar, it is complataly cloggad up with traffic at rush hour in both diractions; but this is not going to produca a grsater amount of traffic yat.

I would hopa that soma thought should ba given to re-routing heavy traffic through Malrosa and eventually to Routa 9 and Huntington Avenua rather than continuing to Massachusetts Avenua.

I baliava that Justin Park should be rebuilt so that no through traffic is encouraged; and I think this should be, hopafully, studiad in detail whan the final construction comas about.

The fourth point that I want to make is in regards to tha East Barkeley Street access. I will support my fellow South Enders in their concerns, and I will advise that the ramps be redasigned to go to Harald Street.

With this, I'm going to finish my testimony.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Requena.

Our next speaker listed on the pre-ragistration schedula is Alfred Penta.

Mr. Joseph Flaharty. Mr. Flaherty?

MR. FLAHERTY: Joseph T. Flaharty representing the Charlestown Board of Trada and tha Charlastown Community CDC, Community Davelopaant Corporation.

We'd just lika to go on rscord that wa are totally in favor of the depression of tha expressway and of tha Third Harbor Tunnel.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

Bernice Madar.

MS. MADER: Yes. Good avaning, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. TIERNEY: Good evening.

MS. MADER: Yes. My name is Bernice Mader. I'm from 108 Connell Street in Quincy.

Tonight, I would like to say at the outset that I am not speaking for the usual group for which I ordinarily speak, and that's the Community Advisory Committee to Massport representing 28 communities that are involved in airport issues.

I am speaking as a private citizen at this time interested in airport and surrounding issue developments. I'm not speaking for those individuals. I'd like to make that clear.

I am sitting here this evening because I want to say that I am in favor of depressing the Central Artery and of building a tunnel which would go from the Mass. Pike area to the Bird Island Flats.

I think that for several reasons. Certainly, I understand the consternation of people in East Boston and the North End over what has happened to them in the past; and I certainly, of all people, understand what they don't want about growth relating to Logan Airport, and I certainly have been one of the most foremost people opposing the harmful growth at the airport.

However, anyone who says that they don't want Logan Airport to grow is foolish. It will grow no matter what we do unless, of course, there is a giant depression of some kind in which people don't use the airport at all. Therefore, we will get the growth no matter what.

As long as your regulation incurs, as long as the federal government continues to expunge from its myths, such as people at the EPA who were any advocates to be hed of environmental concerns around airport growths, the airports will grow.

Federal regulations encourage it to grow rather than discourage it. There is no way one can limit the amount of planes coming and going from an airport. They are totally free to do so, as many as they went to, at will. No airline may be rsduced a slot to fly out of that airport if it wants to.

Therefore, creating a tunnel is not going to encourage or discourage growth objectively, in my opinion. However, what it will do, I hope, is accommodate what will potentially be spill-over traffic in the futura.

I feel badly that the people of East Boston now are having to live with the nightmare of traffic on the streets. I believe that since the airport will

grow no matter what, that the tunnel ought to be built as a way to accommodate that spill-over, that web of traffic that would bleed off into the neighborhood roads because it cannot be accommodated on the present existing roads.

I don't think it will encourage airport growth. I think that will happen on its own; and that will be dependent upon the economy and the number of flights and the price of tickets, not how easily it is to get there because people will get there. If you want to go to Aruba, you go to Aruba. You find a way.

Also, it seems that sometimes people in distress will sometimes prefer a problem that's familiar to a solution that isn't. I think we have to look a little more forward for my friends on the committee from the North End and from East Boston as well.

I think they were dealt a dirty hand when the Massport first expanded. I think that they did experience a serious and harmful device necessary of their neighborhoods based on both political and construction lines.

I think that rather than be a destructive thing, if they use the same regional approach to this problem that we do in the CAC, that instead, this project could be a plus for them rather than a minus; that they

can revitalize their neighborhoods as they revitalize them.

I think there's a chance here, where the North End and East Boston were humpty-dumpty, cracked to bits because of the early paramount expansion which considered nobody and considered only the dollar and the bulldozer -- I think this gives an opportunity for those neighborhoods -- and I'm using the term in the best sense of the word -- it gives those neighborhoods a chance to swipe a deal with both the DPW and the Department of Transportation to put back some of the pieces of humpty-dumpty that were ruined the first time around to make some improvements into their neighborhood, to refurbish some of the areas that were destroyed, to rejoin some of the neighborhoods. I think it's an opportunity for a positive thing to happen rather than for further negatives if the people from East Boston and the North End approach it in the right manner.

I'm also happy to have read that there will be no houses taken. So, there will not be any dissettlement of people in residential areas.

I think that it can be worked out. It can be worked out on a regional approach. Unfortunately, these people are located in access to an area where a region

uses it; and I think it sort of takes a regional approach to solve it, even though they are the ones directly affected by it.

There is something I had to work over once, which was: the more you sweat in peace, the least you believe in war; and I'd rather see a whole group of us sweat-out rather than go to war, and I think it can be sweat-out, if I can use the term. I think it can be compromised.

Something came up in April. I happened to attend a function of the Young Democratic Committee down on the South Shore. They represent candidates, presidential candidates who are running for the democratic party.

Unencouraged by me, although I am involved with transportation issues, two of the staff people, the major staff aides for two of the candidates, the senator from Cranston and Senator Hollins, came early; those two aides.

I had an opportunity just to talk with these people before the evening started. They had no reason to bring it up except to bring it up in passing conversation, and it struck me at the time: both of them didn't know my connection to transportation, but both

of them said in one way or another, How in the hell does anyone get around on the roads here at all?

The person from Cranston said, "I've never seen such awful roads in my life. I've never seen such holes in the road. I can't believe how the traffic can get through anywhere. I've never seen any place like this."

I didn't encourage this, what the person said. So, if that's the first kind of observations that out-of-towners make, I think it's something we have to consider.

I think we also have to consider the fact that the Central Artery will probably -- I can't say how soon because I'm not an expert -- will probably not be safe unless we fix it. I don't think we want another Connecticut.

I think an aerial structure is more prone to have wear on it also from the salt air as well as from the salt being put on the road, and I think it's more apt to deteriorate as a structure than something that would be done down in subterranean level.

It also, to me, makes the potential of what is going to be done to the Southeast Expressway more bearable. That whole project has a potential, again,

of being a very upsetting situation for all the people on the South Shore. True, it needs to be done for both cosmetic and safety purposes; but it holds out hope to those people that what they will endure in the next three years will be worthwhile because there will be something better at the end of the tunnel, sort of speak. There will be something that is an improvement in the situation when it's done.

If we just repair over the expressway leaving it the same size without making any accommodations to it further down on the line, we have not really improved the transit system; and we have a situation where people will say, Well, you want to make people get on to public transit, which is true; but if I am a person who worked in Dooley Square and I took classes at Tufts at night or something in Medford, I'm not going to take the T. I'm going to take my car so I can go to Medford after work and get home by 9:30 or 10:00. For someone like me, I want my car; and for other people who have other various things to do after work, their car is necessary.

Now, the point is: I'm also upset with the City of Boston, I'll mention at this time, for selling all its parking lot parcels.

I understand that coming to work to Boston and

parking there is a privilege for those of us who live in suburbian -- close suburbia, as I do. However, I don't want to pay 3.95 for half an hour in parking. I want to see accommodations made downtown for parking for places like Lafayette Place and Copley Place.

It's nice to have jobs and places to work, but we want spaces too, and I think that's something we have to accommodate; and I will finish very shortly.

Anyway, I think we have to give people some reason to hope. The situation, I think it can be worked out. I think that something better can come out of this by a live, creative imagination; that it does not have to be taken as the negative thing that it is. It can be used to remedy the bad things that have been done to those neighborhoods rather than destroy them further.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

Is Patrick Pigliuca here? He is scheduled to speak.

Peter Cernada?

MR. CERNADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Peter G. Cernada. I'm a member of the Coalition against the Third Harbor Tunnel. I'm a member and vice chairperson of the Massachusetts Coalition of

Citizens with Disabilities.

MR. TIERNEY: Can you turn the mike up a little? That's it. That's fine. I think that will help.

MR. CERNADA: Is that better?

MR. TIERNEY: Yes. Great.

MR. CERNADA: I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of appearing here.

I certainly am very much dismayed that it was not held in an accessible spot. I certainly feel the need. I feel sorry that other people could not be here and could not testify because of this condition; and I certainly hope that, in the future, possibly because of my coming here, somebody else might benefit.

I certainly am very disappointed, and there is not too much at this stage that I can do about it; but let me go back to my original objections to the Third Harbor Tunnel.

I go back to '79 or '78 at the Democratic Policy Committee. When the previous administration was coming in and I appeared at a transportation meeting -- so, I'm not new to this situation -- I objected at that time to the proposal and talked to the present deputy secretary of transportation.

I asked if the third tunnel would not come out on any East Boston property. He said, "I will have to know the complete picture"; but I can say that the deputy secretary of transportation has been consistent, because this was his original plan and he stuck with it, and I'm consistent that I still disagree with it.

I find that living in East Boston is not like living in Quincy. It's a very nice thing to say that this is going to be an amenity. It is not.

In listening to the director of Massport, who, in a statement said he observed -- or his statement was that in 20 years, there would be a 40 percent increase in the traffic at the airport.

Now, using that as a basis, I don't feel too happy about that because if you put four tunnels across there, it's not going to be sufficient. What we need is probably some thought given -- and I see nothing in the alternative proposals -- that there be auxiliary airports.

I can go down and go all the way along to the southeast, New Bedford, coming further this way to Plymouth, coming up further, Norwood; I can go up the other direction, the northeast, where you have Lowell, Lawrence; coming back, you have Peabody. All these

places have plenty of area to build fields.

Now, I think what we are doing is paying too much attention to what Massport wants. We have to give some consideration to the neighborhoods. East Boston will be extinct if any of these tunnels are allowed to be built.

I think you are well aware, Commissioner, that there is presently a bridge that has been inoperable since November 23, 1982; and I think you were around back in 1975, on June 6, when that same bridge became inoperable and was down for two and-a-half years.

While that happened, I had to stay on a street that was so inundated with traffic, that I was throwing-up every half hour. This is an occurrence, again, that should not happen; and these are airport-related vehicle traffic that are penetrating the area which we presently, through your help, have had a little success in re-routing some of them.

But I don't think -- when I can sit outside on a sunny day and see 960 vehicles go by in one hour on a residential street, this is highway traffic. We should not have to bear this kind of a burden.

I would hope that some thought would be given to have Massport, or the legislation, I think where

the legislatives are so much now in favor of this -- and I must admit both of my senators, my representative and my sheriff, are now sponsoring this same plan.

Incidentally, the senator lives up in Waldorf Avenue, which is close to Revere. He probably sees 25 cars go by in an hour and gets panicky; but I see 900-something, and using the estimate of Mr. David that the increase will be 40 percent in 20 years will mean I'll get 300-some odd more or 400 more an hour.

But if that is the pattern, this is intolerable. I don't think that we should be subjected to this. I will hope that this committee, this commission in its wisdom, would really debate a proposal for the Third Harbor Tunnel to the waste basket. It serves no useful purpose as far as the residents of East Boston are concerned.

The deputy commissioner, secretary of transportation, also admitted under questioning at a Chamber of Commerce meeting that there would be no way of controlling the traffic that would come through this Third Harbor Tunnel to come back into the area. So, at a time when they can't go through that other way, they can turn around, go into the airport, and again, infiltrate the streets of East Boston.

I was quite sad about it last Sunday. I came back from Plymouth. I came from Plymouth to almost South Boston in less than 32 minutes. It took me another hour to get to East Boston from South Boston, now, the biggest reason being because everybody was heading through the tunnel; and if there was an extra tunnel, they'd still find ways to use it.

Where I got on was the outside lane, the left lane going north. I couldn't get off, and I had to go; and I finally got to the Mystic Bridge, and there was no traffic. So, there isn't a need.

People have forces of habit; and they automatically assume that if they want to go to Logan or if they want to go north, they have to go through the tunnel. That is not so.

I think if you continue informational seminars or whatever, instructing or advising Massport to tell these carriers, and tell them with some authority, that if we want to stay in East Boston, we have to treat East Boston like they've treated us.

I must say that I supported the present director; and I would hope that he would be amenable to having some survey, some alternative proposal to take and set-up some auxiliary airports where they need them,

where unemployment is prevailing.

You go down to New Bedford, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell; there is high unemployment. Even coming in further. Why can they not have an auxiliary airport there? The last thing I heard why was because some of the carriers do not care for it.

Well, there comes a time when we have to say either the carriers or the people; and these people were there long before the carriers.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Cernada.

Our next pre-registered speaker, if he is here, is Patrick Pigliuca.

Our next pre-registered speaker is Janet Gilardi.

Our next speaker who registersd today is Tom Butler. Is he here? Tom Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Mr. Commissioner, for the record, my name is Tom Butler; and I am the president of the South Boston Citizens' Association. I appear here today, as we have, representing the association; and people of South Boston have come to several meetings concerning this project.

It's the feeling of the group that we were

going to -- initially, we were going to oppose the Third Harbor Tunnel; but at this point, because we still have not received enough valid information and have not been informed of the plan that is going to be used by the State and that we have nothing to sink our teeth into to oppose it, we'd like to report at this time that we reserve our right of judgment on the plan until the plan is known in its entirety with regards to the South Boston Community and a final agreement has been reached and satisfied the South Boston Community with regard to the air vents and the toll plaza. Then we would like to reserve that right to make that judgment.

The community feels that they're still in the dark with regards to many proposals that are going to affect the South Boston community with regards to traffic and other specifics that are going to occur from the building of the tunnel.

It's also one of the more important things that was discussed at the beginning of the meeting in South Boston, that there would be no guarantees for jobs for members of the community for the impacted area.

It's for these reasons of the plan that we reserve right of judgment at this point.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Patrick Pigliuca? Janet Gilardi? Both registered earlier.

Tony Mastandrea? Is he here? We're running out of speakers.

Ken Campbell?

MR. CAMPBELL: Good evening, Mr. Commissioner. You are a very patient man to withstand all this lengthy hearing.

MR. TIERNEY: I think if you raise the mike up, it would help the stenographer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is that better?

MR. TIERNEY: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. I'm Kenneth Campbell, a resident of Dartmouth Street in the South End, a 15-year resident of Boston; and I'm studying this problem as a resident and as a Globe reporter as an MBTA public information officer.

I think the Central Artery depression is a plan of vision, a plan that will help restore to the scale we need; but I'm not quite ready to support it yet because we look at the impact on the South End as a very serious impact on that community.

In the impact statements, the South End intersections are linked with South Boston; and while we're

linked with South Boston, our new city district, there are different issues for the two communities; and they are obscured by the fact of having the Albany Street intersection, the East Berkeley Street, the Herald Street intersections put in as South Boston intersections. They really are South End, and they have direct impact on the South End because the traffic that goes off those streets goes through the heart of the South End.

The South End has been the subject of tremendous public and private investment over the past 15 years. There is private investment that has included all elements of the society, rich and poor, black and white. I think it would be very bad public policy to forego those investments and to make, virtually, a mini-highway through the heart of the residential community.

About ten years ago, I realized that, after looking over some notes, it was then that we proposed to the EIS that a new street be created parallel to Herald Street or widening of Herald Street over what is now the railroad property owned by the State.

Some of the work on the southwest corner already has the supporting posts installed in the railroad, by the way, which would permit a deck to be placed there and which would permit traffic to run on that street.

If that Herald Street expansion or extension can then be extended to connect up to the Back Bay in the vicinity of Columbus Avenue and Clarendon, which is difficult -- I think it's impossible -- it would be the good new traffic pattern to bring people into the Back Bay.

I might add that the Back Bay is, of course, undergoing radical change with Copley Place. I understand a new Prudential Tower is on the drawing board of a Cambridge architectural firm, a 90-story tower. So that there are other things that are going on in the Back Bay. There will be more traffic coming that way.

The traffic coming off the Central Artery from the South Shore now gets off at the Frontage Road and comes up East Berkeley Street, and the traffic going south of the Back Bay either cuts through Dartmouth Street over Clarendon Street or goes all the way over to Arlington and Herald Street.

The plan that the South End has proposed would direct that traffic to the Arlington Street/Herald Street area, which would be around the neighborhood, rather than right through the heart of it.

Another point to look at is that we have a superb road that goes to the Back Bay which you can't

get off at the Back Bay. That's the Massachusetts Turnpike.

I suggest that in this massive look we are making here, that we add one other element, which is for the State to consider buying from the Mass. Turnpike Authority the end of the turnpike as far as essentially the Hancock Tower area so that the connections could be made from the South Shore and from the North Shore and could bring in via the turnpike with exits -- develop someplace in that area to go right in the Back Bay. Getting back on is a more difficult problem; but if you can solve this, you can solve a lot of other things.

The one other element which is not directly a part of this is the traffic pattern for Dartmouth. I realize this is beyond your scope. I'd like to raise it, which is that I'd like to have the traffic pattern that is looked at in this EIR/EIS, to consider the impacts of extending Dartmouth Street northbound routing, which now goes from Stewart to Beacon, and to have it extended from Columbus Avenue to Beacon passed Copley Place northbound only with, perhaps, a southbound dead-end access to a proposed new parking garage which I hope would be in the 400- to 500-car vicinity for Copley Place's new lead tenant, IBM. That's assuming that that

part of the garage is environmentally feasible, which is now under wraps.

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I appreciate your attention.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.

I have before me two lists: one of people who have pre-registered, one of people who have registered recently within the past couple of hours.

I will call people who were on the pre-registered list in this time slot to see if any of them are available to speak.

PatrickPigliuca? Janet Gilardi? Gerald Pallotta?

MR. PALLOTTA: I'm sorry. What's your name? I never heard your name.

MR. TIERNEY: My name is Robert Tierney. I'm the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works.

MR. PALLOTTA: I'm Gerry Pallotta. I live on Fulton Strsat in the North End. Where I live is one block from the end of the tunnel. I also live one block from the existing elevated structure.

I want to say that I'm 100 percent in favor of the depression of the Artery as well as that I think

it's very important that we also have the Third Harbor Tunnel.

I'm a salesman that lives in the North End, and I spend a majority of my time in my car; and on any given day, I may go back and forth between East Boston and the North End or the Mass. Pike, etc. -- I may go in, you know, three times a day; and if anyone knows what a mess it is to go from either west or south and have to go to East Boston -- I think that just simply redecking the existing structure would be a major mistake, and I want to go on record of saying I'm in favor of the whole project.

So, I want to point out that I do live in the North End; and I live one block from it, and I look forward to the construction because I think it will be an improvement.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Pallotta.

Tony Mastandrea?

MR. MASTANDREA: Good evening. I'm Tony Mastandrea, president of Machinists State Council and also business agent for the Machinists Union in District 38 in Boston.

We, the machinists, are wholeheartedly in

favor of the current plan to depress the Central Artery and the tunnel. We feel that the value that will be derived from the billions of dollars coming into the community -- we think of the economic spin-off. We think even the one percent that's supposed to go for the art will be a tremendous value for the area.

Many people talk about many other side issues; but the real issue before us here is necessity and viability of the two projects; and for the machinists union, we endorse both of them wholeheartedly.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Mastandrea.

Mrs. Margaret Caruso? Neil Glick?

MR. GLICK: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Neil Glick; and I'm a resident of Boston.

FROM THE FLOOR: We can't hear you. Can you speak louder?

MR. GLICK: My name is Neil Glick.

MR. TIERNEY: I think you have to put your microphone somewhere where I have it.

MR. GLICK: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Neil Glick. I'm a resident of Boston. I'm here as a private citizen to speak in favor of the proposed depression of the Central Artery, but I'm adamantly

opposed to any Third Harbor Tunnel option.

I think that the Third Harbor Tunnel option is a turning-around of the basic environmental values that this administration of Massachusetts ran on, and I think it's also a turning-around of the basic environmental values of the basic values here in the City of Boston.

I think any highway development in the urban core of the Boston area is an attempt to make what is a dense urban environment, but a pleasant environment, into a Kansas City or a Los Angeles.

We have an area where people can walk to work, where people can live in the downtown area. That's rapidly deteriorating because of the air pollution and the other undesirable effects that are so clearly stated in the environmental impact report summary.

MR. TIERNEY: Excuse me.

FROM THE FLOOR: If he talks louder, then we won't say a word.

MR. TIERNEY: We can't have you talking, and we can't have him talking.

MR. TIERNEY: If you will put the microphone as close to your mouth --

FROM THE FLOOR: We can hear you, sir; but we

can't hear him.

MR. TIERNEY: Okay. I'm trying to hear him.

MR. GLICK: As I say, I think that building a highway in the urban core of Boston, which is essentially where the Third Harbor Tunnel is, is to turn your back on the basic values that we do value here in Boston and to create a situation that is more attuned to a Kansas City or a Los Angeles, a car-dominated environment.

We have an environment here where people can walk to work, where people can live in the downtown area. That's rapidly deteriorating because of factors such as air pollution; and the air pollution in our region is very clearly, I think, from automobiles.

This report, this Environmental Impact Report, makes it very clear that air pollution will continue unabated except for across-the-board increases in federal requirements for vehicle pollution controls because of the Third Harbor Tunnel option. The no-build option, Alternative 6 is the one that creates less air pollution and is the one then that I would support because it will increase the good factors of our existing urban environment in Boston.

There are two basic values that run through the Harbor Tunnel options, all of them: and that is that

you get a reduced queues time or a reduced traffic tie-up time on the Central Artery, and you get a small modicum of economic development at the airport.

I submit that none of the tunnel options will accomplish the first goal. History teaches us that building highways, especially in urban areas, doesn't reduce traffic. After all, the Sumner and Callahan Tunnels were designed to do just that; and as the gentleman before me said, they certainly don't. They won't. The only way to reduce traffic is to reduce automobile consumption or reduce automobile usage on the existing highway pattern and to support Mass. Transit.

I must say that I'm very dismayed that the alternatives presented in the Environmental Impact Report Summary do not speak to Mass. Transit at all. They don't speak to the option of having a ferry cross the harbor, or they don't speak to the harbor of improving Blue Line access to the airport. They only speak to improving automobile access.

So, the citizens of Boston must once again swallow the bad air, swallow the hydrocarbons and the other noxious fumes that come out of the commuter automobiles while individuals -- and I'm not talking about car pools because there aren't many car pools that you

see on the Southeast Expressway. I'm talking about individuals riding in individual cars who are encouraged by the State by action of building a Third Harbor Tunnel.

In the airport development aspect of it, sure, there is airport development going on right now. Whether the Third Harbor Tunnel is necessary for that, I sincerely doubt that.

So, I would issue a charge to this State here. I think what the State has to do is show the kind of courage that past administrations have and to turn down the easy federal buck, the 90 cents to a dollar, the federal aid highway dollar, and turn it into Mass. Transit, turn it into a good project, like the present Central Artery which will reclaim urban ground and make for a better environment for our city, but not to encourage automobile use, not to encourage the kind of hazardous waste that comes out of the tail pipes of automobiles and the trucks and whatnot that you're going to encourage, and the oil consumption, the oil and gas consumption that you encourage as well.

This is the 80's. It seems to me that we can go through our history of highway building in urban areas, and it's not done any of those urban areas good; and Boston has been fortunate it has been spared many

of the disasterous effects that have plagued other cities because of big highway projects that have cut through it.

In 1983 to embark upon another such venture seems to me not only unwise, but unreasonable; and I would again encourage the State to come up with a plan that will, yes, move people to Logan Airport sufficiently, will get people to the airport when they need to get to the airport, will get people to East Boston when they need to get to East Boston, but will not create the atmosphere of pollution and the atmosphere of urban decay that necessarily accompanies highway development.

I think that we, in the state, have made a real commitment in the last couple of years to cleaning up our industrial hazardous waste sites. What we haven't done is: we haven't focused on cleaning up our urban hazardous waste problems, including the pollution of our air, the destruction of our urban fabric and our urban core area by road projects and by the over-usage of automobiles.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Glick.

Mr. Patrick Pigliuca? Janet Gilardi? Mrs. Margaret Caruso? Dr. Marilyn Canis? Leo Purcell?

MR. PURCELL: Mr. Chairman, my name is Leo Purcell. I'm a business representative for Local 103 of I.B.E.W. I represent 3,000 electrical workers in the Greater Boston area.

I understand that I'm here at a time when the word "redundant" must be becoming redundant. So I'll be brief.

As a representative of labor, I support the Third Harbor Tunnel and the expansion and depression of the Central Artery.

In the short-run, the 2 billion dollars worth of construction work will create many needed jobs. This in itself will have a great economic and social impact to the men and women of this region.

After first having seen the negative impact which serious employment creates within the family -- the strength of our social fabric -- 10 to 12 years of employment for a projected 5,700 person years of on-site construction-employment will pay obvious benefits to the families of these workers, the merchants who they deal with, and the state and society which they are a part of.

However, we are not here for a jobs program. Our concern is jobs, but there are more concerns from

that. Twenty acres of prime property via air-rights could well be developed, which will continue the beautification of our State Capitol, attracting developers and the businesses which will follow.

At the same time, there will be eliminated a cramp in Boston as well as in Massachusetts progress. That cramp is a transportation system by way of tha Central Artery and existing tunnel that just doesn't work, and we know that. Traffic that includes private vehicles and commercial and industrial vehicles have difficulty travelling through the quagmire of these outdated routes.

The Impact Statement Report projects a horrendous future for our city and state in its travels if these projects are not undertaken that we're here discussing tonight.

Being from Dorchester, I have an inherent concern for neighborhood hazards and impacts on the people who live in these neighborhoods. I'm convinced that after reviewing this same Environmental Impact Statement, the advantages completely outwalgh any disadvantages that we might consider. I do not take disruptions in neighborhoods lightly.

It only makes sense to me, and to the people

that I represent, that we must act now on this endeavor. 90 percent funding will not be offered to us again in the near future. In effect, we cannot wait. We must eliminate the cramp in Boston and in Massachusetts.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

We'll take a short break while we change the tape.

(At this time, a short recess was taken.)

MR. TIERNEY: Let me go through the list again of the registered speakers who have not appeared: Patrick Pigliuca, John Gilardi, Margeret Caruso, Dr. Marilyn Canis.

Our next recently registered speaker is Arthur Hartnett.

MR. HARTNETT: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. For the record, my name is Arthur Hartnett. I am the president of the South Boston Residents Group.

At this time, the South Boston Residents Group must take a position of neither approving nor opposing the project because the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Report under review in comments here is severely lacking in many specifics that would allow one to properly evaluate the proposal.

The South Boston community has expressed great concern regarding the impacts as follows:

Air quality; specifically, carbon minoxide and other auto exhaust emissions.

Traffic generated on local streets, and especially with regard to the effects that congestion might impair community access to areas outside the South Boston community.

Potential new traffic generated by ease of access in proximity to container terminals, both existing and planned.

Construction, espacially disruption to normal, every-day patterns of living.

Mass. Transit; i.e., MBTA, particularly with regard to MBTA, Red Line operations as well as South Boston community bus work and tha catalytic effect upon development of the Fort Point Channel in non-access areas.

The South Boston community, including but certainly not limited to the South Boston Residents Group, the South Boston Information Center, the South Boston Citizens Association, and the South Boston Community Development Corporation, must be fully involved and consulted on all aspects of the project in and around

tha South Boston community so that the final Environmental Impact Statement and Report will specify all details currently lacking in the draft Environmental Impact Statement Report.

Some of the details that must be included are as follows:

Siting of tunnel vents. Effect of the vents and toll plaza upon air quality with projected numerical values. Projections for both initial levels of traffic and roadway saturation levels. Data on current air quality values in numerical form must also be provided. The end results of the figures presented will be to give a clear understanding of the effects of allowing the traffic in the city.

Traffic counts: Present and projections for initial opening and for when proposed roadways reach level of saturation. Projections as to when proposed roadways reach level of saturation that exists at present. Percentage of increase expected in traffic for a container terminal operation. Construction time tables as it will affect enclosures of currently used roadways and bridges and as it will affect MBTA operations.

Agreements as to specific routings of construction vehicles are waiting for residential streets.

Agreements as to specific routings of construction vehicles through residential streets.

Agreements to clean streets that are soiled by construction vehicles on a regular basis so that the fugitive dust is mitigated.

Agreement that when routings or activity will present a conflict to the South Boston community residents commuting to and from their jobs, said activity will be temporarily suspended.

These details are by no means inclusive, but are meant to be a basis for further dialogue and cooperation to the end that the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Report will contain all of the necessary information to make a rational and sound judgment of the merits of the proposals.

We, the South Boston Residents Group, look forward to working together to obtain the high ideals this proposal hopes to advance.

We, the residents of South Boston, also suffer from the saturation of the present roadway system; but we must stress that our community cannot and will not be intolerable of these problems caused by flight from the city to the suburbs. We have chosen to stay and will not bear the burden of penalty for so choosing.

Remember, also: the development in the downtown area has caused a burdensome increase in the demands upon the roadway system; and that development was never tempered with forethought about roadways. Just bear that in mind when the development of the air rights and the Fort Point Channel area comes.

Thank you very much.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

The next speaker, Mr. Kalin.

MR. KALIN: My name is Bob Kalin, former president of the Association of Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen, Local 105.

I'm a life-long resident of Charlestown; and I can remember the days when I was a kid, when the neighborhood was open during the war, with the traffic situation in the city; kids getting hit by cars.

I can see that all coming back now; and I think the Artery, the depressed Artery and the Third Tunnel would help prevent this; and I'm for it 100 percent.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Kalin.

Robert Flynn.

MR. FLYNN: Hi. My name is Bob Flynn. I'm

a life-long resident of Charlestown, a former Board Committee man and State Democratic Board Committee Caucus member.

MR. TIERNEY: I think if you speak into the microphone, the people in the back can hear you.

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

I'm speaking affirmatively for the depression of the Central Artery and for the Third Harbor Tunnel.

I'm a life-long resident of Charlestown. I've seen now the saturn traffic on the North Washington Street toward the end of my town leaving Boston. I think the congestion that -- it would relieve the traffic flow and realign New Rutherford Avenue up at the direct access from the North Washington Street Bridge.

Also, the tunnel. That would be the affected Chelsea Street, which could connect with the Mystic-Tobin Bridge. It would alleviate the outsiders which are coming in congesting our town so we can't even reach our homes.

I'm 100 percent for the projects and the jobs it would make available for people of Charlestown to do work in different building trades.

I'd just like to say that I think it's the first time I've seen a corrective action being taken

for the expressway. It was obsolete before it was even completed.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Flynn.

Mr. Ensign? William Ensign?

MR. ENSIGN: My name is William Ensign. I'm from Westfield out of the western part of the state. I'm also a member of the National Association of Railroad Passengers.

I hope there is some attention being given to this project to the possibility of adding a rail line which would effectively connect North and South Stations. We may never, never again be able to see this realized.

As everyone knows, the Northeast Corridor effectively has South Station in Boston; yet we have considerable rail service to the northern borders of Massachusetts with a very real possibility of service being extended up to Maine and New Hampshire. If we have a rail line to the proposed depression of the Central Artery, we will be able to connect effectively passengers north of Boston with points as far south as Washington in direct rail service. It would be a great social, economic, and positive environmental improvement for the area.

Again, we have a Trailway situation in New York City. I believe they are presently discovering that there is a strong possibility of connecting Grand Central and Penn Station; and I believe if we have this same kind of service north of Boston to the south like they have in New York, we would have the pleasure here to add this additional railroad.

Thank you very much for your attention.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Ensign. I should tell you that the present EIS does not include it. We will consider that option.

MR. ENSIGN: Thank you very much.

MR. TIERNEY: Let me go through the list again of people who have registered earlier: Dr. Marilyn Canis? Margaret Caruso? Janet Gilardi? Patrick Pigliuca?

Brad Bankman.

MR. BANKMAN: My name is Brad Bankman, and I represent Tolman Manufacturing & Supply Company located at 63 Dorchester Avenue, South Boston, opposite Gillette Safety Razor Company.

The company sells welding supplies and industrial gases and has been located in South Boston since 1898. The company thanks this hearing for alloting

this time to express its view on this project and wishes to go on record as opposing the re-location of Dorchester Ave. insofar as the taking of company land as designated in plan 5A Modified; specifically, the westward widening of Dorchester Ave. in front of the business to accommodate a grass medium strip running from Broadway Station to South Postal Annex.

This plan would make it very difficult for customers to park and for deliveries to be made and may, in fact, force relocation. It is our view that an old established company of this city deserves every consideration to carry on its business and that improvements in city traffic should not only be sympathetic to business needs, but should be made to help their growth, not hamper it.

Certainly, taking this valuable land to plant grass in the middle of a busy thoroughfare does not make sense in this case, and that a less costly solution would be to forget the grass down the middle of this section of Dorchester Avenue and leave it as is.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: What's the name of your company?

MR. BANKMAN: Tolman Manufacturing & Supply Company.

MR. TIERNEY: Clark Frazier. Mr. Frazier had spoken earlier; and because we are almost running out of speakers, Mr. Frazier is permitted to speak again.

MR. FRAZIER: Thank you for your indulgence. My name is Clark Frazier, Dwight Street, South End.

I failed to mention before the public transportation aspects of the so-called proposed Third Harbor Tunnel. One of the major issues of the South End that we began to realize that East Berkeley Street was going to be a real problem was all the people who went to put hotels in the Back Bay and the airport and using taxis, limousines, and so on. Where are those all going to go? They've gone to visit the pot holes in the South End.

The problem of public transportation access to the airport is not one that can be solved in a simple way. I think that the most important issue you have, because if there is a 40 percent growth in the airport, you're going to have 40 percent more cars there -- you will not be able to do it. You will not be able to park in East Boston. You will not be able to park at the airport. You will have the situation like San Francisco Airport with a traffic jam from the gates where people are unloading at the airport for so long that they back

out onto the freeway and actually block commuter traffic that's trying to go up and down because they cannot get in and out of the airport.

Therefore, it is necessary -- it is essential to have a very, very direct connection between the airport at South Station if there is a tunnel that will allow a very frequent shuttle bus service or whatever, a shuttle bus service between the airport and South Station, and would also give -- there is the Herald Street extension -- some kind of shuttle-type service in the Back Bay.

Without that, building the Third Harbor Tunnel, which would be something of an airport queue or something you never thought about -- an airport queue that will back up all the way back to the Southeast Expressway to the Central Artery and probably nullify any work you do.

So, we must have public transportation improvements. You must have direct links from the South Station and the airport if you do the tunnel.

Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Frazier.

Sandra O'Connell.

MS. O'CONNELL: My name is Sandra O'Connell,

and I'm a commuter. I drive the expressway every single day, and I've driven it for 20 years.

It is a nightmare. It now takes me between one hour and an hour and-a-half every single morning to get to work. I think this project is a wonderful project, and I hope you will go through with it.

However, can you add more lanes? Can you put the in-bound on top of the out-bound, therefore making it five or six lanes in each direction, projecting the volumes in ten years when the project will be completed?

Also, I have traveled -- I do extensive traveling on vacation; and I have gone to the airport and come home at midnight, and I have been in bumper-to-bumper traffic through that tunnal at midnight. That doesn't seem possible, but it is; and I think that's an absolute disgrace.

I think it's wonderful, another Third Harbor Tunnel; but make sure you have enough lanes in each direction so you're not creating another nightmare like you have now and make sure that you have enough lanes in the depression of the Central Artery.

I want to go on record that I think it's a great project, and I hope that it will get built.

MR. TIERNEY: Can you tell us where you live?

MS. O'CONNELL: 18 Bickford Road, Braintree.

MR. TIERNEY: Braintree?

MS. O'CONNELL: Braintree, yes.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

Dr. Marilyn Canis.

DR. CANIS: I just rushed to get here. So I apologize if I'm going to repeat something that has been said before.

MR. TIERNEY: You're going to have to speak into this microphone so the stenographer/typist can hear and I can hear you and everybody else. So, if you get close to the microphone, it would help.

DR. CANIS: First, I'd like to say that I'm a resident of the North End. I've been a property owner and taxpayer for the past six years.

Mr. Salvucchi addressed our neighbors; and I just want to say for the record that I was very impressed with his presentation, not only for the mechanics of the plan to depress the Central Artery, but for the sensitivity that he showed to the North End residants to their concerns.

I don't think anyone here can deny that our present Artery is a complete eyesore. It's a traffic hazard and a health hazard. So, if we all realize that

this is so, I can't understand why people are against having it depressed.

I can only assume that concern would amount to inconvenience to them. I think it's important for everyone to realiza that we're going to be inconvenienced one way or another. We're certainly going to be more inconvenienced if they repair the existing Artery; and I think that if the people of this city allowed thainconvenience of construction to hold back projects in the past, Boston wouldn't be the thriving city it is today.

My very biggest concern is: the tima is running out on us. This is our final opportunity to have 90 percent federal financing; and if we don't take advantage of this situation -- I, myself, am quite convinced that a depressed Artery is inevitable. If wa don't do it ourselves now, I think we're going to ba forced into this decision in tha naar future; and my concern is that we will not only have to bear tha burden of inconvenience at that time, but we will have to possibly bear a terrible tax burden.

So, it worries me that tima is slipping out of our hands while this is unfortunately becoming a political issue.

That's all I have to say.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you.

We have at the moment run out of speakers. If any of you want to testify, all you have to do is walk to the back of the room and register and come right up here.

FROM THE FLOOR: Excuse me. If I speak, I'd like to hang everybody who wants a tunnel. So, I don't want to talk. I don't want to get people excited because it's a health hazard, sir. Being a health hazard, I'm against it.

Since we've had progress going through the City of Boston, we've had nothing but a dead city. The only thing you need is tombstones, and that's the end of it and going around to breath another ten years.

I don't have to get up there. That's my say.

MR. TIERNEY: Anybody who doesn't want to get up here and still wants to have their testimony recorded can write a lettsr.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'll write a letter to the governor who promises he's not going to have it; but he insists on it now. He ain't going to get off that hook.

MR. TIERNEY: Anybody who wants to submit testimony can write a letter to the Massachusetts

Department of Public Works, 100 Nashua Street, Boston; and assuming we get the letter within two weeks, it will be as much a part of the testimony as if you had testified here.

Our purpose in being here is to record testimony of people who want to be recorded. We'll have a recess to see if anybody else wants to speak.

(At this time, a recess was taken.)

MR. TIERNEY: Can I have your attention, please. We will reconvene the hearing on the Central Artery/ Third Harbor crossing as soon as everyone sits down.

My name is Robert Tierney. I'm the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works.

We have one speaker registered recently, Mark Ferris.

MR. FERRIS: Good evening, Commissioner. My name is Mark Ferris. I'm a resident of East Boston, the Orient Heights section of East Boston; and I currently reside at 11 Borden Street in Orient Heights, East Boston.

Just as a prefatory statement, I'd like to say that it seems with the construction of the Central Artery and the tunnel, East Boston residents have been given a very rare opportunity to become truly political

participants in the selection process for the Central Artery and the tunnel; and because of that, East Boston residents have the opportunity, as they have not had in the past, to state what are some of the concessions they would like to gain and redress some of the wrongs that both, unfortunately, the State Planning Board and Massport -- the grievances they've had with Massport in the past.

The construction of the Third Harbor Tunnel does not directly impact, and by no means do I say that it does, the residents of Orient Heights. Speaking as a resident of that section, I can say, however, there are many a subtle influence, many a subtle appendage of airport construction that has encroached on my neighborhood and surrounding community of which I live.

Currently, airport-related activity has spread from the airport itself up to Route 1A and split over into Boardman Street and down the neighboring streets. It's made its way there in many forms, both in aircraft and vehicular traffic which has jeopardized both the safety and the environmental quality of what is and hopefully will remain to be currently a residential, heavy residential area.

The tunnel itself, from the perspective of the

residents of Orient Heights, would be no more than the increase of the operation of the capacity of Logan itself. This would take its form within a substantial influx of passenger automobiles, straight forwarding firms, air cargoes, and service-related vehicles in the form of parking facilities and parking lots. It is on these two points, jet aircraft, noise pollution as well as automobile and service-related vehicular noise and pollution, that I'd like to make the case for Orient Height residents.

Currently, Orient Height residents living between the areas of Bonds Avenue and Saratoga Street through Bay Water Street of Orient Heights, East Boston, are impacted as no other area of the city is. They are subject to parallel operations from runways 22, left and right, on which a river runs and simultaneously with parking and full left and full right.

The reason I bring this up -- we discussed, as I mentioned, the Central Artery and the Third Harbor Tunnel; but because, as I said, the tunnel's potential for being nothing more than an extension of Logan in its operational capacity, I feel this does warrant attention. Because of the tunnel and the increased traffic, I feel that there will be increased operational capacity

of Logan Airport and, therefore, of the Orient Heights neighborhood.

The bottleneck would result on Route 1A. Currently, Route 1A is congested. There are four partying traffic firms, two of them being cargo freight carriers and Toomey's and one which is in construction, park and fly operations. These have made their way into the local neighborhoods of Orient Heights.

We'd like to call on the State Planning Board, first of all, to help fully put a cap on the amount of automobile traffic and parking. In other words, parking facilities within the area. In other words, an amendment of our zoning within East Boston. In other words, what we call for is a cap or a freeze on the automobile parking and operational parking facility, parking and flying laws between the city. We call on that, number one.

We'd also call on Massport to give serious consideration to the restructuring of Route 1A and the Bell Circle, which hopefully will be able to accept the volume of traffic from the tunnel and airport-related expansion within that area.

We'd also call on Massport -- Massport itself, hopefully, as I mentioned earlier -- the jet aircraft

traffic and noise resulting from increased operation which we believe the tunnel would result in -- we call on Massport to address its commitment to hopefully take their soundproofing measures off the table, okay, which were proposed back about five years ago, take them off the table and realistically look at time and impacted areas with some substantial soundproofing work.

We'd also ask Massport to give serious consideration to the Orient Heights area in a means of restructuring its present one-way advisory system or its processing, modifying it to disburse the noise levels evenly over East Boston and the surrounding communities. Thus far, we don't know if that's being done.

So, therefore, the tunnel in itself -- although the tunnel in itself in regards to Orient Heights would not directly impact us -- there would be no loss of homes, there would be no restructuring of the roadways in Orient Heights -- there are many, many a subtle effects from the tunnel which we feel warrant attention of Orient Heights and, in general, East Boston residents.

We're hoping also that the commission itself will take heed of relocating the service-related in-streets; for example, the parking lots and parking/fly operations which now are currently beginning to encroach upon the

Orient Heights neighborhood, will take those lands and redeposit them on airport property and would, in turn, take that land and be able to better utilize it as a neighborhood jobs training facility or something. In other words, to leave the land undeveloped in and of itself.

That's about all. Thanks very much.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Ferris.

David Stratudo.

MR. STRATUDO: Thank you for providing me with this opportunity to express several opinions that I have. I'm not an expert in anything concerning transportation except that I have long been a -- tried to use public transportation in my daily lifestyle and avoid use of automobiles as much as possible because I see individual use of automobiles to be very much more --

MR. TIERNEY: Could you tell us where you live, your home?

MR. STRATUDO: Oh, I'm sorry. I live in Lexington --

MR. TIERNEY: Lexington?

MR. STRATUDO: -- and I have business in Boston occasionally.

Although it's much easier to drive to Boston

from a place such as Lexington -- most people do, and I don't have any impressive figures before me or anything; but I would just like to urge the State office of Transportation and Governor Dukakis to take a hard look at our overall strategy for transportation in the metropolitan area.

Obviously, the present Central Artery and building a third tunnel would encourage automobile traffic. Hopefully, the trade-off would be that there will be less severe traffic jams. That I can't argue either way; but there will definitely be increased automobile traffic, and we need to work towards -- move towards a more public transportation system overall.

We can study and make statements of what effects particular actions would have; but I think very few people would dispute that more frequant bus service, more frequent and extended train service and subway service would encourage public use of Mass. Transit.

You know, when we build a wider Artery, aren't we just putting off those 12-hour traffic jams for another -- I don't know -- ten years, twenty years, whatever? There are going to be more and more people and more and more people using cars, and there are so many costs to the use of cars. There is lost real estate

in parking lots that certainly there must be greater assessments possible if those parking lots were buildings, and there is just that much more maintenance. The recent bridge collapse in Connecticut accompanying review of our state roads and state bridges and just bringing to surface the cost of that maintenance.

These proposals, although I don't deny that they're well-thought out and they will help decrease traffic congestion in Boston -- and I'm not saying that shouldn't happen; but I would really urge the transportation office and Governor Dukakis to think about the costs of private transportation as well. We can't even afford to maintain the roads we have now. We've been building roads, expanding roads for some 80 years for automobiles; and we haven't been able to catch up. We haven't been able to catch up because we haven't planned properly and because we haven't really taken a look at where we're going.

Especially at the local level, there is a great opportunity to expand public transportation. There is much less corporate pressure from automobile manufacturers, much less influence from oil companies to build roads instead of public transportation; and really, public transportation, bus service, just costs

a fraction of what it would cost to maintain and build roads.

I don't have the plan; but I'm just asking that the governor and his state take a look at these issues; and there are certainly many moves that can be made that would encourage less polluting-types of transportation and less costly-types of transportation and, in the end, less costly to the individual in terms of both his dollar costs and general environmental costs.

That's really about all I had to say. I'd speak longer, but I have to catch the last bus to Lexington. Thank you very much.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you for your testimony.

Is there anyone else who wants to testify?

We'll have a recess.

(At this time, a recess was taken.)

MR. TIERNEY: We're going to reconvene the hearing.

Why don't you sit in the chair nearest the speaker.

MR. CAPPUCCI: Yes. Good evening, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for giving me a second opportunity to testify regarding the Third Harbor Tunnel and the proposed Central Artery.

MR. TIERNEY: Can you give your name, please, for the record?

MR. CAPPUCCI: Yes. For the record, my name is Robert Meany Cappucci; and I'm a candidate for District 1, City Councillor. Therefore, I have both a personal and political concern in terms of representing people besides my own personal interests from the area of East Boston and the North End and Charlestown.

Again, I'm out, if I may, in the field all day long campaigning; and I come across many, many people greatly concerned about these two major multi-build projects, and I feel personally responsible if I do not sincerely represent their interests.

However, as I stated last night, I want to be able to work with this administration and any administration; and therefore, I feel in the case of the Third Harbor Tunnel and the Central Artery, that it would be best for me to try to act as a catalyst between the administration and the communities involved.

I hope to prevent, if I may, the communities from being short-changed. The tradition for projects such as this is to, if I may, jam them down the communities' throat; and I have an idea that this administration does not do things that way. I sincerely will not allow

that to happen to these people.

Therefore, I feel if certain amenities are applied to the construction of these two projects, it's possible that the people will feel that the projects will not only be in the best interest of transportation, but will be in the best interest of the residents and the businesses of both areas.

Therefore, to briefly reiterate what I said last night, the Third Harbor Tunnel -- I would take a hard stand on my position that the tunnel must surface on Massachusetts Port Authority. I would suggest that the exits and entrances on the proposed Bird Island Flats section of the Massport Authority will join what I may term a joint culdesac in terms of allowing people to come to the airport in order to drop off/pick up passengers or, in fact, take a straight flight to whatever destination they want and then come back and drive away utilizing one of the parking lots within the immediate area of the airport.

I feel, again, that that type of proposed construction of the Third Harbor Tunnel will then be an asset to East Boston because the numbers that the consultants have given me show that 53 percent of the airport traffic through the Callahan Tunnel and then

after leaving the airport back through the Sumner Tunnel would, if a Third Harbor Tunnel were to be built, bring the vehicular flow through the Callahan Tunnel and Sumner Tunnel to 47 percent, which is a 37 percent reduction.

That, in turn, would then, I feel, behoove passengers that are not airport-related and want to use the Sumner and Callahan Tunnels leaving north of Boston to then stay on Route C1 rather than take a short-cut through community streets, because presently they do this. They take this type of course driving their automobile through the street because they don't want to get caught in a traffic jam.

So, therefore, I feel East Boston will be doing itself a service by allowing the Third Harbor Tunnel and the airport project.

One thing I did not mention last night is that I did communicate unofficially to the Secretary of Transportation, Fred Salvucchi, that I would like him to -- this was at the July 29th or 30th meeting. I forget. I believe it was the 29th in East Boston and again in the North End on the 30th; and then again, August 2, then August 3, and I believe August 5 at the Marriott Hotel.

I suggested that the secretary might want to look into what I feel would be another selling point, if I may, to the community; and that is, to tear down the exit ramp that now exits coming out of the Callahan Tunnel. Therefore, if Commuter X wants to go to the airport and he comes through the Callahan Tunnel, he or she -- they will not be able to take a right after coming out of the tunnel and up the ramp. There would be no place to go except north if there is no exit. The exit I'm talking about parallels the former GE building.

Therefore, if this exit is torn down, then Commuter X coming from west or south of Boston would have no choice but to use the Third Harbor Tunnel which will have then, I hope, a joint culdesac so that there shouldn't be any reason to use East Boston streets.

So, I hope that in the one billion dollars, monies will be appropriated approximately $100,000 to tear down the ramp that now allows people to go to the airport via the Callahan Tunnel.

With regards to the Central Artery, once again, the North End people are very upset, very concerned about this project. I told them that if elected, I will do all I can to try to get the top-side of the 2.1 billion dollars proposed Central Artery depression developed to

meet some of their needs.

Again, last night, I, for the record, said that these needs are subsidized housing, a youth center for the North End youths -- they don't have a youth center in the North End.

I would like to see multi-leveled parking. Parking is terrible in the North End. The businesses tell me they're losing from 3 to $400 per day because clients can't find a place to park. Residents, some of them, had to give up their automobile even though they had a North End sticker, residential sticker. They could not find a place to park.

So, I'm very concerned about parking and housing and a youth center.

Furthermore, I would like to see some open space designed in the development so that they can go out and get some fresh air or sit down on a bench. I've also been asked by the people in the North End to have cultural interests; see if, in fact, this complex could also contain some kind of workshops for theater groups, etc.

It may seem like quite a development; but, again, I feel for an overall cost of 2 billion, 100 million for the Artery to be depressed, I think the top-

side element that I'm talking about would range minimum 20 million, maximum 40 million; and I hope that this administration will try to put something together in terms of a suitable, possibly private developer, that will know where to find these funds.

I understand the Department of Transportation would only be interested in funding the Artery. However, I do believe that we could piggy-back funds for this project in terms of requesting HUD to participate in terms of possible rental subsidies, a mortgage subsidy.

I think that the Department of Commerce could get involved with the multi-leveled parking lot. I believe that the present governor could utilize some of the CDPG monies, Community Development Parking Grants that come from the federal administration; and hopefully, he could channel these for the top-side development of some of these funds to provide for construction subsidized rents. I believe they have a lot of talent in this administration, and they can be creative enough to tailor top-side development and say thank you to the North End people; and hopefully, this administration will use their talent to try to appease the East Boston people, again, with a tunnel that would be 90 to 100 percent involved with the airport. You can say thank you

to East Boston by freeing up the traffic and not by giving them more traffic.

I want to be a good City Councillor. I want to be able to work with whatever administration is in office as long as I'm in office if I'm elected. I also want to represent the people the way I believe good representatives would.

So, I want to be able to communicate; yet I'm not going to, if I may, sell the people that I represent down the river. That's not Bob Cappucci. That will never be Bob Cappucci.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to testify tonight. Thank you.

MR. TIERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Cappucci.

Does anybody else want to testify this evening? Any new-comers?

We'll recess.

(At this time, a recess was taken.)

MR. TIERNEY: Since there are no other people here to testify and since it's five minutes to 11, I declare this public hearing closed.

(Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 10:55 p.m.)

6-106

CERTIFICATE

I, Cindy L. Lamberta, CSR, RPR, CM, and Notary Public, do hereby certify that the foregoing record, Pages 1 through 105, is a complete, accurate, and true transcription of my stenographic notes taken in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

CINDY L. LAMBERTA, CSR,RPR,CM

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COMMISSION
20 SOMERSET STREET BOSTON 02108

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE
727-5215

CONTACT: Cheryl Yaffe
727-5215

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
9 August 1983

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COMMISSIONER WILLIAM J. GEARY TODAY TESTIFIED IN SUPPORT OF THE DEPRESSION OF THE CENTRAL ARTERY AND THE THIRD HARBOR TUNNEL

Metropolitan District Commissioner William J. Geary today testified in strong support of the depression of the Central Artery and the third harbor crossing. The Metropolitan District Commission is the agency with the primary responsibility for police and emergency services on the Central Artery, as well as the agency responsible for the preservation, protection and enhancement of the region's parks and open spaces. Commissioner Geary focused on the issues of public safety and environmental improvement.

The Central Artery is Boston's major North - South Connector as well as a major route to Logan Airport. It is the region's most important transportation facility and the region's number one traffic congestion problem. At present the Artery is far exceeding its capacity, with 180,000 cars per day using the road and traffic projections of a ten percent increase over the next twenty years. This aging and overburdened structure will have to be rebuilt or replaced within the next ten years in order to keep the route operational.

- more -

- 2 -

The Central Artery now experiences 3½ times the national accident rate for urban highways. In 1981 Metropolitan District Commission statistics indicated a total of 682 accidents in the area from the City Square on-ramp through the Dewey Square Tunnel; 1982 resulted in similar statistics. Ninety percent of these accidents involved personal injury.

The enormous congestion and hazardous design of this short stretch of road is the reason for the alarming amount of accidents. The many access ramps merge on to a highway that has inadequate deceleration and acceleration lanes and no breakdown lanes.

Commissioner Geary explained the role of the Metropolitan District Commission Division of Central Services, which provides motorist aid, emergency services and unique capabilities to handle critical accident situations. The Commissioner showed dramatic photographs of serious truck accidents along the Artery responded to by Metropolitan Police and the Metropolitan District Commission Central Services Special Emergency Operations Unit. He estimated that this unit responds to similar accidents on this stretch of road 55 times a year. Also, the Division's Motorist Aid Patrol, which operates daily, assists thousands of disabled vehicles per year.

The public safety concerns when the Central Artery is jammed from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. as projected in the Environmental Impact Statement is startling. As it is now, there is grave concern in this city for the ability of emergency vehicles to get through city streets.

Commissioner Geary stated, "It is the Metropolitan District Commission's opinion that a depressed and widened Central Artery will provide the citizens of this city and this region with a safer and more efficient highway system. As the agency responsible for policing the Central Artery during construction, it is our judgement that mere reconstruction of the artery will not remove the causes of the many accidents."

- more -

- 3 -

Commissioner Geary emphasized that one of this agency's foremost mandates is to preserve, enhance and develop the urban park characteristics within the Metropolitan area.

The depression of the Central Artery will eliminate the gruesome elevated structure which for years has been the dark cloud over Boston's streets as well as an obstruction to the city's historic waterfront area. The Metropolitan District Commission will be working in cooperation with the Department of Public Works on design improvement for the proposed twin bridges over the Charles River Dam.

Commissioner Geary said, "In conclusion, it is my hope that the Metropolitan District Commission can work with state and federal agencies to not only provide the region with a safer transportation system, but also improve and enhance the environment and liveability of the city."

###

Boston Educational Marine Exchange
5 B Lewis Wharf Boston MA 02110 617 523 7611

COMMENTS ON THE THIRD HARBOR TUNNEL/WIDENED & DEPRESSED CENTRAL ARTERY EIS PRESENTED BY THE BOSTON EDUCATIONAL MARINE EXCHANGE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING, 8/9/83

The Boston Educational Marine Exchange objects to the adverse impact of the Third Harbor Tunnel/Widened and Depressed Central Artery plan on the Fort Point Channel. The Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately consider the value of the Channel itself and its potential to fill important recreational, tourism, marine commerce and water transportation needs of Boston and Massachusetts. Nor has the Environmental Impact Statement adequately considered alternative transportation modes including ferry service which, taken together, could considerably ease traffic on existing roadways.

A surface roadway along any portion of the downtown Channel edge is objectionable and would be inimical to recreational use. One would think that with the downtown portion of the Southeast Expressway (Central Artery) staring us in the face that this would be generally realized.

The Environmental Impact Statement has not taken into account potential use of the Channel as a downtown harbor for boats with the attendant recreational and development activities and tourist dollars to be gained from such a waterfront attraction. The City lacks docking and other facilities for boats. The Fort Point Channel, a "harbor of refuge" at the core of downtown, is a logical place for boats and, in fact, has been designated for this use in the City's plan for the Harbor.

As proposed by the Boston Educational Marine Exchange, the Channel could accomodate as many as 1500 boats, with a possible 600 power boats above the Summer Street Bridge. Public landings, ramps, water taxi terminals, a breakwater/

pier for visiting tall ships and cruise ships, a promenade along the Channel edge with attendant cafes, restaurants and other amenities are all part of this exciting proposal. (See accompanying poster.)

Next year the Tall Ships will visit Boston and, again, there will be no place for them downtown. In addition, the Antique and Classic Boat Regatta, a new annual event, anticipates 100 boats. Where will we put them? For two years now the Fort Point Channel has provided the site for a brave new boat show. There is no question that boating events are popular with the public; they also enrich the coffers of the city and its merchants. There is no reason why, in the future, a marine oriented Channel couldn't be as big a draw (or bigger) than Annapolis or Newport -- both multi-million dollar affairs.

The EIS has not sufficiently addressed impacts on the marine recreational use of the Channel nor the question of revenue accruing to the City from such development. Per boat spending on restaurants, supplies, recreational shopping and the like would amount to considerable in a season, as would income the City would reap in property taxes from marina assessments. Annapolis and Newport have turned private pleasure boating into by far their major economic activity. Any EIS on the Tunnel/Artery should certainly look at potential revenue that would be generated by a recreational boating complex in the Fort Point Channel.

The EIS has not covered impacts on the Channel's potential use as a water transportation arm to the new South Station Transportation Center. Streamlined water-buses similar to those used so effectively in Amsterdam could fit under the bridges and call at a South Station landing at the foot of Summer Street to speed passengers to Logan Airport, North Station and other harborfront destinations. This would also help alleviate traffic downtown.

The question of density of projected development in the Dewey Square/Fort Point Channel area and the need for the breathing space a Channel recreational area could provide needs to be considered.

A surface roadway, so-called "New Dorchester Avenue" in the Tunnel/Artery plan, along the edge of the Channel is antithetical to recreational use of the Channel. Who wants to promenade along a highway or, for that matter, sit on a boat deck beside rushing cars. This would also be a deterent to sidewalk cafes and other commercial recreational development along the waterfront. A classic mistake cities have come to regret is putting roadways along their waterfronts.

Alternative transportation measures to ease traffic congestion have not been looked at in the EIS and need to be before a decision on the Tunnel/Artery is made. Area boat operators are eager to run ferry service from the South Shore to downtown and Logan; all they are waiting for are the landings. Massport is willing to provide a landing at Logan. The City is requiring the developer of Rowes Wharf to provide a ferry terminal. A landing in the Channel could make the AMTRAK and bus station connection. Ferries with connector bus links, revived train service along the Old Colony Line, improved T service, park and ride, subscription bus services, van-pool could all act to alleviate traffic from south of Boston into and through downtown. In fact, the process of finding alternative ways is already underway in part due to the impetus of the Southeast Expressway reconstruction.

Time and time again, grandiose building plans have become obsolete scarce they have been completed. There is a need for the EIS to project its vision and imagination into the future. 12 years from now, the anticipated completion date of the Tunnel/Artery project, use of the private car in the city may be on the wane with totally different forms of people movers taking its place.

The Fort Point Channel offers a dramatic opportunity to reintroduce a rich variety of marine activities of a contemporary nature at the very heart of downtown Boston. Tunnel/Artery impacts on this potential need to be thoroughly examined before a decision is made.

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Property Of
Library

Property of
BOSTON REDEV. [illegible] NT AUTHORITY
[illegible]

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library

Property of
BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Library